

THE

Churchman's Magazine.

VOL. 6.] NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1809. [No. 6.

BIOGRAPHY.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE REV. GEORGE HERBERT.

[Continued from page 314, and concluded.]

ABOUT three months after his marriage, Dr. Curle, who was then Rector of *Bemerton* in *Wiltshire*, was made Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, and not long after translated to *Winchester*, and by that means the presentation of a Clerk to *Bemerton* did not fall to the Earl of *Pembroke*, (who was the undoubted patron of it) but to the King, by reason of Dr. Curle's advancement; but *Philip*, then Earl of *Pembroke* (for *William* was lately dead) requested the King to bestow it upon his kinsman *George Herbert*, and the King said, "Most willingly to Mr. Herbert, if it be worth his acceptance:" and the Earl as willingly and suddenly sent it him, without seeking; but though Mr. Herbert had formerly put on a resolution for the Clergy; yet, at receiving this Presentation, the apprehension of the last great account that he was to make for the cure of so many souls, made him fast and pray often, and consider for not less than a month; in which time he had some resolutions to decline both the Priesthood, and that living. And in this time of considering, "He endured (as he would often say) such spiritual conflicts, as none can think, but only those that have endured them."

In the midst of those conflicts, his old and dear friend Mr. *Arthur Woodnot* took a journey to salute him at *Bainton*, (where he then was with his wife's friends and relation) and was joyful to be an eye-witness of his health and happy marriage. And after they had rejoiced together some few days, they took a journey to *Wilton*, the famous seat of the Earls of *Pembroke*; at which time the King, the Earl, and the whole Court were

there, or at *Salisbury*, which is near to it. And at this time Mr. *Herbert* presented his thanks to the Earl for his Presentation to *Bemerton*, but had not yet resolved to accept it, and told him the reason why ; but that night the Earl acquainted Dr. *Laud*, the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, with his kinsman's irresolution. And the Bishop did the next day so convince Mr. *Herbert*, "That the refusal of it was a sin," that a tailor was sent for to come speedily from *Salisbury* to *Wilton*, to take measure and make him canonical clothes against the next day ; which the tailor did, and Mr. *Herbert* being so habited, went with his Presentation to the learned Dr. *Davenant*, who was then Bishop of *Salisbury*, and he gave him institution immediately, (for Mr. *Herbert* had been made Deacon some years before) and he was also the same day (which was April 26, 1630) inducted into the good, and more pleasant than healthful village of *Bemerton*, which is a mile from *Salisbury*.

"I have now brought him to the parsonage of *Bemerton*, and to the 36th year of his age, and must stop here, and bespeak the reader to prepare for an almost incredible story of the great sanctity of the short remainder of his holy life ; a life so full of *charity*, *humility*, and all Christian virtues, that it deserves the eloquence of St. *Chrysostom* to commend and declare it ! A life ! that if it were related by a pen like his, there would then be no need for this age to look back into times past for examples of primitive piety ; for they might be all found in the life of *George Herbert*. But now, alas ! who is fit to undertake it ? I confess I am not : and am not pleased with myself that I must ; and profess myself amazed, when I consider how few of the Clergy lived like him then, and how many live so unlike him now : but it becomes not me to censure ; my design is rather to assure the reader that I have used very great diligence to inform myself, that I might inform him of the truth of what follows ; and though I cannot adorn it with eloquence, yet I will do it with sincerity."

When at his induction he was shut into *Bemerton* Church, being left there alone to toll the bell, as the law requires him ; he staid so much longer than ordinary time, before he returned to his friends that staid expecting him at the church door, that his friend Mr. *Woodnot* looked in at the church-window, and saw him lie prostrate on the ground before the altar : at which

time and place (as he afterwards told Mr. *Woodnot*) he set some rules to himself, for the future management of his life, and then and there made a vow to labour to keep them.

And the same night that he had his induction, he said to Mr. *Woodnot*, " I now look back upon my aspiring thoughts, and think myself more happy than if I had attained what I so ambitiously thirsted for : and I can now behold the Court with an impartial eye, and see plainly, that it is made up of *fraud*, and *titles*, and *flattery*, and many other such empty imaginary painted pleasures ; pleasures that are so empty, as not to satisfy when they are enjoyed : but in God and his service, is a fulness of all *joy* and *pleasure*, and no satiety : and I will now use all my endeavours to bring my relations and dependants to a love and reliance on him, who never fails those that trust him. But above all, I will be sure to live well, because the virtuous life of a Clergyman is the most powerful eloquence to persuade all that see it to reverence and love, and at least to desire to live like him. And this I will do because I know we live in an age that hath more need of good examples than precepts. And I beseech that God, who hath honoured me so much as to call me to serve at his altar, that as by his special grace he hath put into my heart these good desires and resolutions, so he will by his assisting grace give me ghostly strength to bring the same to good effect : and that my humble and charitable life may so win upon others, as to bring glory to my JESUS, *whom I have this day taken for my Master and Governor* ; and am so proud of his service, that I will always observe, and obey, and do his will, and always call him *Jesus my Master* : and I will always condemn my birth, or any title or dignity that can be conferred upon me, when I shall compare them with my title of being a *Priest*, and serving at the *Altar of Jesus my Master*."

And that he did so, may appear in many parts of his book of *Sacred Poems* ; especially in that which he calls the *Odour*. In which he seems to rejoice in the thoughts of that word *Jesus*, and say that the adding these words, *My Master*, to it, and the often repetition of them, seemed to perfume his mind, and leave an oriental fragrantcy in his very breath. And for his unforced choice to serve at God's Altar, he seems in another place of his poems (*the Pearl*, Matt. 13.) to rejoice and say, " He knew the ways of learning ; knew what nature does willingly ; and

what when 'tis forced by fire ; knew the ways of honour, and when glory inclines the soul to noble expressions ; knew the Court ; knew the ways of Pleasure, of Love, of Wit, of Music, and upon what terms he declined all these for the service of his *Master Jesus* ; and concludes saying,

That thro' these labyrinths, not my groveling wit,
But thy silk-twist, let down from heaven to me ;
Did both conduct, and teach me how by it
To climb to thee.

The third day after he was made Rector of *Bemerton*, and had changed his sword and silk clothes into a canonical coat ; he returned so habited with his friend Mr. *Woodnot* to *Bainton* : and immediately after he had seen and saluted his wife, he said to her, " You are now a Minister's Wife, and must now so far forget your father's house, as not to claim a precedence of any of your parishioners ; for you are to know, that a Priest's Wife can challenge no precedence or place, but that which she purchases by her obliging humility ; and I am sure, places so purchased do best become them. And let me tell you, that I am so good a herald, as to assure you that this is the truth." And she was so meek a wife, as to assure him it was no vexing news to her, and that he should see her observe it with a cheerful willingness. And indeed her unforced humility, that humility that was in her so original, as to be born with her, made her so happy as to do so ; and her doing so begot her an unfeigned love, and a serviceable respect from all that conversed with her ; and this love followed her in all places, as inseparably as shadows follow the substance in sunshine.

Mr. HERBERT had no sooner entered upon his charge than he hasted to get the Parish Church repaired, to beautify the Chapel which stands near his house, and to repair the Parsonage house : the two latter works were performed at his own proper charge ; and having completed the last, he caused these verses to be stuck up in his hall.

To my Successor :
" If thou chance for to find
A new House to thy mind,

And built without thy cost ;
Be good to the Poor,
As God gives thee store,
And then my labour's not lost."

The following Ember-week he was ordained Priest by Dr. *Hinchman*, Bishop of *London*, who never mentioned him but with veneration for his excellent life and learning. "I laid my hands (said he) on Mr. HERBERT's head, and alas ! within less than three years lent my shoulder to carry my dear friend to his grave."

He had *counted the cost*, and being resolved to regulate his conduct with uniform propriety, he set down his rules in that order as the world now sees them printed in a little book called the *Country Parson*. His behaviour towards God and Man was a practical comment on the Rules he prescribed in that useful book. A book so full of plain rules that no country parson can scarcely be excused for not having it, because it will direct him what to do, and convince him for not having done it.

The text for Mr. HERBERT's first sermon was from the Proverbs, *Keep thy heart with all diligence*. In this discourse he gave his parishioners many necessary Rules for the discharge of a good conscience both to God and Man ; he delivered it in a florid manner, with great learning and eloquence ; but in the close acquainted them, "That should not be his constant way of preaching, and that he would not fill their heads with unnecessary notions ; but that for their sake, his language and his expressions should be more plain and practical in his future sermons." The texts for his future sermons were constantly taken from the Gospel for the day.

He was decent and regular in his public devotions, always appearing with his whole family twice every day at prayers in the chapel. And such was the effect of his piety, that most of his parishioners, and many gentlemen of the neighbourhood constantly made part of his congregation, and some of the labouring class would leave their plough when his bell rung to prayers, that they might join in his adorations to God ; and would afterward return to the field, thinking themselves happier for carrying back to their labours the blessing of their holy and

revered Pastor ; so powerful was his example to persuade others to a practical piety.

But these public devotions never occasioned any neglect of his private intercourse with God, or of family worship. Every day's sanctity was made by him a step towards that kingdom where impurity cannot enter.

Thou shalt converse of them by the way, was a command of the Jewish Lawgiver respecting his statutes. The nobler doctrines of Christianity Mr. HERBERT well knew to be deserving such a recommendation, and therefore in his frequent walks, he embraced the opportunity to speak on divine subjects to such persons as he met on the road. Entering into a free conversation with a gentleman he one day overtook, "I beg to be excused (said he) if I ask some account of your faith ; and I do this the rather, because though you are not of my parish, yet I receive Tithe from you by the hand of your tenant ; and, Sir, I am the bolder to do it, because I know there be some sermon-hearers that be like those fishes that live always in salt water, and yet are always fresh."

After this expression he proposed to him several apposite questions, and having received his answer, gave him such rules for the trial of his sincerity, and for a practical piety, and in such a meek and winning manner, that the gentleman was entirely won with his discourse, and often after contrived to throw himself in his way.

Another pleasing anecdote is related of him. One day meeting a neighbouring Minister, they entered into conversation on the wickedness of the times, and the contempt with which the Clergy were treated ; on which Mr. HERBERT took occasion to say, "One cure for these distempers would be for the Clergy themselves to keep the Ember-weeks strictly, and beg of their parishioners to join with them in fasting and prayers for a more religious Clergy.

"And another cure would be for themselves to restore the great and neglected duty of catechising, on which the salvation of so many of the poor and ignorant lay-people does depend ; but principally, that the Clergy themselves would be sure to live unblameably ; and that the dignified Clergy especially, who preach Temperance, would avoid surfeiting, and take all occasions to express a visible humility and charity in their lives ; for

this would force a love and an imitation, and an unfeigned reverence from all that knew them : (and for proof of this, we need no other testimony than the Life and Death of Dr. Drake, late Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.) This (said Mr. HERBERT) would be a cure for the wickedness and growing atheism of our age. And, my dear brother, till this be done by us, and done in earnest, let no man expect a reformation of the manners of the laity : for 'tis not learning, but this, this only that must do it ; and till then the fault must lie at our doors."

Attending the private Music Meeting at Salisbury, he one day saw a poor man with a poorer horse, that was fallen under his load ; they were both in distress, and needed present help ; which Mr. HERBERT perceiving, put off his canonical coat, and helped the poor man to unload, and after to load his horse : the man blest him for it : and he blest the poor man, and like the *good Samaritan*, he gave him money to refresh both himself and his horse ; and told him, *That if he loved himself, he should be merciful to his beast.* Coming to his musical friends at Salisbury, they began to wonder that he came into company so soiled and discomposed ; but he told them the occasion. And when one of the company had told him, *He had disparaged himself by so dirty an employ ;* his answer was, *That the thought of what he had done would prove music to him at midnight ; and that the omission of it would have upbraided and made discord in his conscience, whensoever he should pass by that place ; for if I be bound to pray for all that be in distress, I am sure I am bound so far as it is in my power to practise what I pray for : And though I do not wish for the like occasion every day, yet let me tell you, I would not willingly pass one day of my life without comforting a sad soul, or showing mercy ; and I praise God for this occasion : And now let's tune our instruments.*

Thus did Mr. HERBERT daily take every fair occasion to instruct the ignorant, or comfort the afflicted, and always confirmed his precepts by showing humility and mercy, and ministering grace to the hearers.

His liberality and bounty to the poor was very great ; and he was happy in having a charitably disposed woman to his wife, whom he made his almoner, and paid into her hands constantly a tenth part of his ecclesiastical revenue, to be by her given to the poor ; but this did not lessen his own charities, to which indeed he

*revered Pastor ; so powerful was his example to persuade others to a practical piety.

But these public devotions never occasioned any neglect of his private intercourse with God, or of family worship. Every day's sanctity was made by him a step towards that kingdom where impurity cannot enter.

Thou shalt converse of them by the way, was a command of the Jewish Lawgiver respecting his statutes. The nobler doctrines of Christianity Mr. HERBERT well knew to be deserving such a recommendation, and therefore in his frequent walks, he embraced the opportunity to speak on divine subjects to such persons as he met on the road. Entering into a free conversation with a gentleman he one day overtook, "I beg to be excused (said he) if I ask some account of your faith ; and I do this the rather, because though you are not of my parish, yet I receive Tithe from you by the hand of your tenant ; and, Sir, I am the bolder to do it, because I know there be some sermon-hearers that be like those fishes that live always in salt water, and yet are always fresh."

After this expression he proposed to him several apposite questions, and having received his answer, gave him such rules for the trial of his sincerity, and for a practical piety, and in such a meek and winning manner, that the gentleman was entirely won with his discourse, and often after contrived to throw himself in his way.

Another pleasing anecdote is related of him. One day meeting a neighbouring Minister, they entered into conversation on the wickedness of the times, and the contempt with which the Clergy were treated ; on which Mr. HERBERT took occasion to say, "One cure for these distempers would be for the Clergy themselves to keep the Ember-weeks strictly, and beg of their parishioners to join with them in fasting and prayers for a more religious Clergy.

"And another cure would be for themselves to restore the great and neglected duty of catechising, on which the salvation of so many of the poor and ignorant lay-people does depend ; but principally, that the Clergy themselves would be sure to live unblameably ; and that the dignified Clergy especially, who preach Temperance, would avoid surfeiting, and take all occasions to express a visible humility and charity in their lives ; for

this would force a love and an imitation, and an unfeigned reverence from all that knew them : (and for proof of this, we need no other testimony than the Life and Death of Dr. Drake, late Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.) This (said Mr. HERBERT) would be a cure for the wickedness and growing atheism of our age. And, my dear brother, till this be done by us, and done in earnest, let no man expect a reformation of the manners of the laity : for 'tis not learning, but this, this only that must do it ; and till then the fault must lie at our doors."

Attending the private Music Meeting at Salisbury, he one day saw a poor man with a poorer horse, that was fallen under his load ; they were both in distress, and needed present help ; which Mr. HERBERT perceiving, put off his canonical coat, and helped the poor man to unload, and after to load his horse : the man blest him for it : and he blest the poor man, and like the *good Samaritan*, he gave him money to refresh both himself and his horse ; and told him, *That if he loved himself, he should be merciful to his beast.* Coming to his musical friends at Salisbury, they began to wonder that he came into company so soiled and discomposed ; but he told them the occasion. And when one of the company had told him, *He had disparaged himself by so dirty an employ* ; his answer was, *That the thought of what he had done would prove music to him at midnight ; and that the omission of it would have upbraided and made discord in his conscience, whensoever he should pass by that place ; for if I be bound to pray for all that be in distress, I am sure I am bound so far as it is in my power to practise what I pray for : And though I do not wish for the like occasion every day, yet let me tell you, I would not willingly pass one day of my life without comforting a sad soul, or showing mercy ; and I praise God for this occasion : And now let's tune our instruments.*

Thus did Mr. HERBERT daily take every fair occasion to instruct the ignorant, or comfort the afflicted, and always confirmed his precepts by showing humility and mercy, and ministering grace to the hearers.

His liberality and bounty to the poor was very great ; and he was happy in having a charitably disposed woman to his wife, whom he made his almoner, and paid into her hands constantly a tenth part of his ecclesiastical revenue, to be by her given to the poor ; but this did not lessen his own charities, to which indeed he

set no limits, for he never turned his face from any he saw in want; as he often went to the mean habitations of his poor neighbours, he informed himself personally of their wants, and relieved them cheerfully if they were in distress, and would always praise the God of all grace who had made him as willing as able to do it. When he was advised by a friend to be more frugal, on the probability of his having children of his own to provide for; his answer was, "I will not see the danger of want so far off, but because the Scriptures do so commend *Charity*, as to tell us, that *Charity* is the top of Christian virtues, the covering of sins, the fulfilling of the *Law*, the life of *Faith*; and that *Charity* hath a promise of the blessing of this life, and of a reward in that life which is to come; because these, and more excellent things are in the Scriptures spoken of thee, *O Charity*; and that all my tithes, and church-dues are a deodate from thee, *O my God!* make me, *O my God*, so far to trust thy promise as to return them back to thee; and by thy grace I will do so, in distributing them to any of thy poor members that are in distress, or do but bear the image of Jesus my Master. Sir, (said he to his friend) my wife hath a competent maintenance secured her after my death, and therefore as this is my prayer, so this my resolution shall by God's grace be unalterable."

This is a slight sketch of the active part of his life, in which he continued *exercising himself to godliness* till a consumption so weakened him as to confine him to his house, or to the chapel, which almost joins it, in which he continued to read prayers constantly twice every day, though he was very weak; in one of which times of his reading, his wife observed him to read in pain, and told him so, and that it wasted his spirits, and weakened him; and he confessed it, but said, his life could not be better spent than in the service of his Master Jesus, who had done and suffered so much for him. But, said he, I will not be wilful, for though my spirit be willing, yet my flesh is weak; and, therefore, Mr. Bostock shall be appointed to read prayers for me to-morrow, and I will now be only a hearer of them, till this mortal shall put on immortality.

To a pious clergyman who had called on him, when parting, he said, "Sir, I pray give my brother Farrer an account of the decaying condition of my body, and tell him, I beg him to continue his daily prayers for me: and let him know, that I have

considered, that God only is what he would be, and that I am by his grace become now so like him, as to be pleased with what pleaseth him, and tell him, that I do not repine, but am pleased with my want of health ; and tell him, my heart is fixed on that place where true joy is only to be found ; and that I long to be there, and do wait for my appointed change with hope and patience." Having said this, he did with so sweet a humility as seemed to exalt him, bow down to Mr. Duncan, and with a thoughtful and contented look say to him, " Sir, I pray deliver this little book to my dear brother Farrer, and tell him, he shall find in it a picture of the many spiritual conflicts that have past betwixt God and my soul, before I could subject mine to the will of Jesus my Master ; in whose service I have now found perfect freedom : desire him to read it ; and then, if he can think it may turn to the advantage of any dejected poor soul, let it be made public : if not, let him burn it : for I and it are less than the least of God's mercies." Thus meanly did this humble man think of this excellent Book, which now bears the name of *THE TEMPLE : or, Sacred Poems, and Private Ejaculations ;* of which Mr. Farrer would say, " There was in it the picture of a divine soul in every page ; and that the whole book was such an harmony of holy passions, as would enrich the world with pleasure and piety." And it appears to have done so : for there have been more than twenty thousand of them sold since the first impression.

When Mr. *Farrer* sent this Book to *Cambridge* to be licensed for the press, the *Vice-Chancellor* would by no means allow the two so much noted verses,

*Religion stands a tiptoe in our land,
Ready to pass to the American strand,*

to be printed ; and Mr. *Farrer* would by no means allow the Book to be printed, and want them : But, after some time, and some arguments for and against their being made public, the *Vice-Chancellor* said, " I knew Mr. HERBERT well, and know that he had many heavenly speculations ; and was a Divine Poet ; but I hope the world will not take him to be an inspired Prophet, and therefore I license the whole Book : " so that it came to be printed, without the diminution or addition of a syllable, since it was delivered into the hands of Mr. Duncan.

To his friends he would often say, "I now look back upon the pleasures of my life past, and see the content I have taken in beauty, in wit, in music, and pleasant conversation, are now all past by me, like a dream, or as a shadow that returns not, and are now all become dead to me, or I to them; and I see that as my father and generation hath done before me, so I also shall now suddenly (with Job) make my bed also in the dark; and I praise God I am prepared for it; and I praise him that I am not to learn patience, now I stand in such need of it; and that I have practised mortification, and endeavoured to die daily, that I might not die eternally; and my hope is, that I shall shortly leave this vale of tears, and be free from all fevers and pain: and which will be a more happy condition, I shall be free from sin, and all the temptations and anxieties that attend it; and this being past, I shall dwell in the *New Jerusalem*; dwell there with men made perfect; dwell where these eyes shall see my Master and Saviour Jesus; and with him see my dear mother, and all my relations and friends. But I must die, or not come to that happy place: and this is my content, that I am going daily towards it, and that every day which I have lived hath taken a part of my appointed time from me, and that I shall live the less time, for having lived this and the day past." These and the like expressions, which he uttered often, may be said to be his enjoyment of heaven, before he enjoyed it. The Sunday before his death he rose suddenly from his bed or couch, called for one of his instruments, took it into his hand, and said—My God, my God,

My music shall find thee,
And every string
Shall have his attribute to sing:

And having tuned it, he played and sung:

The Sundays of man's life,
Threaded together on Time's string,
Make bracelets, to adorn the wife
Of the eternal glorious King;
On Sundays, heaven's door stands ope;
Blessings are plentiful and rife;
More plentiful than hope.

Thus he continued meditating, and praying, and rejoicing, till the day of his death ; and on that day said to Mr. *Woodnot*, " My dear friend, I am sorry I have nothing to present to my merciful God but sin and misery ; but the first is pardoned, and a few hours will now put a period to the latter ; for I shall suddenly go hence and be no more seen." Upon which expression, Mr. *Woodnot* took occasion to remember him of the re-edifying *Layton Church*, and his many acts of mercy ; to which he made answer, saying, " They be good works if they be sprinkled with the blood of Christ, and not otherwise." After this discourse he became more restless, and his soul seemed to be weary of her earthly tabernacle ; and this uneasiness became so visible, that his wife, his three nieces, and Mr. *Woodnot*, stood constantly about his bed, beholding him with sorrow and an unwillingness to lose the sight of him whom they could not hope to see much longer. As they stood thus beholding him, his wife observed him to breathe faintly, and with much trouble, and observed him to fall into a sudden agony ; which so surprised her, that she fell into a sudden passion, and required of him to know how he did ? To which his answer was, " That he had past a conflict with his last enemy, and had overcome him, by the merits of his Master Jesus." After which answer, he looked up and saw his wife and nieces weeping to an extremity, and charged them, " If they loved him to withdraw into the next room, and there pray every one alone for him ; for nothing but their lamentations could make his death uncomfortable." To which request their sighs and tears would not suffer them to make any reply : but they yielded him a sad obedience, leaving only Mr. *Woodnot* and Mr. *Bostock*. Immediately after they had left him, he said to Mr. *Bostock*, " Pray, Sir, open that door, then look into that cabinet, in which you may easily find my last will, and give it into my hand ; which being done, he delivered it into the hand of Mr. *Woodnot*, and said, " My old friend, I here deliver you my last will, in which you will find that I have made you my sole Executor for the good of my wife and nieces ; and I desire you to show kindness to them, as they shall need it ; I do not desire you to be just, for I know you will be so for your own sake : but I charge you, by the religion of our friendship, to be careful of them." And having obtained Mr. *Woodnot*'s promise to be so, he said, " I am now

ready to die." After which words he said, "Lord, forsake me not now my strength faileth me : but grant me mercy, for the merits of my Jesus ; and now Lord, Lord, now receive my soul." And with those words breathed forth his divine soul, without any apparent disturbance. Mr. Woodnot and Mr. Bostock attended his last breath, and closed his eyes.

Thus he lived and thus he died like a Saint, unspotted by the world, full of alms-deeds, full of humility, and all the examples of a virtuous life.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

EPISCOPACY VINDICATED:

In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. MILLER, by the Rev. JAMES KEMP, D. D. Rector of Great Choptank Parish, Dorchester County, Maryland.

(Continued from p. 369, and concluded.)

LETTER VI.

BUT whatever opinion you might have formed, as to the mere preliminary advances towards the great work, it is rather calculated to excite a suspicion, that you are indeed not serious, when you intimate, that those who fixed the liturgy and articles, were not Episcopalians in principle. If there be any thing clearly deducible from language—if it be safe on the most momentous occasions, to judge of men's principles from their acts, we must surely admit the English Reformers to have been no Presbyterians. In the twenty-third article it is said, "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." In the thirty-sixth article,

the book of consecration, set forth in the reign of Edward VI. is recognized, and all such as are ordained according to it are deemed "to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered." In this book, there are three offices, for the ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And it is declared, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time, there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." I should have imagined, no man would have denied, that here there are three things fixed—1st. *That there were three orders in the Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, from the time of the Apostles*—2d. *That Episcopal ordination was the right ordination*—and, 3d. *That without this ordination, no man could lawfully perform the duties of a minister.* But after quoting only the 23d article, you conclude, "that there is not a syllable said of Diocesan Bishops, or of the necessity of Episcopal ordination." And this is all true. But, Sir, is this fair dealing? Because these things are not mentioned in the twenty-third, are they mentioned no where else? Or is it possible, that the English Reformers could have meant to recognize as *valid*, the ministry and ordinances of churches not Episcopally organized? To look with a favourable aspect towards the Reformers on the continent, to avoid all pointed expressions and invidious comparisons, was, in my opinion, a mark of their wisdom and moderation. It was surely enough for them to assert their own principles. And believing, as many of them did, that the Reformers on the continent were under an absolute *necessity* of either acting as they did, or returning to the communion of Rome; hoping that a more settled state of things would permit them to return to the principles and order of their Church; admiring their zeal, and pitying their difficulties, they studiously avoided any thing irritating; looking forward to the happy period when, like themselves, they would be at liberty to organize their Church on a correct foundation. But still, though they possessed these amiable sentiments respecting the Reformers on the continent, they never admitted their churches to be *regularly* organized. This was the opinion of Bishop Burnet. He was a strict Episcopalian. He asserts frequently and clearly, that Episcopacy is of divine origin—he affirms that to organize a Church upon other principles would

be a "*very great sin*," unless the necessity were great and apparent. But he admits, that such a necessity might and had existed. A Church however, thus irregularly formed, he pronounces to be, in an "*imperfect state*."*

Nor is it true, "that the influence of the crown was exerted in favour of prelacy," nor that "the Reformers yielded to the establishment of diocesan Episcopacy, as the most suitable form of government in the circumstances then existing," page 219. Such assertions ought not to have been lightly made, as they greatly affect the character of the English Reformers. The public standards of that Church, the Liturgy, the Articles, and the Ordinal were all compiled by the most pious and learned clergymen of the nation. Nor were they under any instructions or any control whatever, that might have biassed their minds. Dr. Heylin says, in forming the Liturgy, they had, "in the first place, an eye and respect to the most sincere and pure religion taught by the Scripture; and, in the second, to the usages of the primitive Church.† And the declaration of Bishop Burnet is to the same amount. "It being resolved to bring the whole worship of God under *set forms*, they set one general rule to themselves, which they afterwards declared, of changing nothing for novelty's sake, or merely because it had been formerly used. They resolved to retain such things as the primitive Church had practised."‡

The Ordinal, there is little doubt, was framed by the same persons who compiled the Liturgy, except the Bishop of Chichester. In this work too, we are told by Dr. Heylin, they followed the rules of the primitive Church. And Bishop Burnet expressly asserts, that the first Ordinal afforded no ground of belief, that Bishop and Priest were not considered as of distinct orders.||

During the reign of Edward VI. there is nothing to be found to induce one to believe, that Episcopacy was, in any degree, opposed. And it is well known, that in that reign, Calvin exerted all his influence to have other things in his own way. No sooner had he heard of the commencement of the reformation

* Burnet on the Articles, page 381.

† Heylin's Hist. page 65.

‡ Burnet's Hist. of the Ref. vol. ii. page 73.

|| See Burnet's Hist. of the Ref. vol. ii. page 144.

in England, than he offered his assistance to Archbishop Cranmer, but it was refused. He next addressed the Lord Protector, and with him acquired some influence. But this he used, not like his followers, against a *form* of common prayer, for that he readily allowed, but against some things in the Liturgy, the Homilies, and the Ceremonies. It was reserved for the unfortunate reign of Queen Mary to lay the foundation of that bigotted and persevering opposition to the English Episcopacy, which the followers of Calvin, and not Calvin himself, commenced and pursued. Some of the exiles, who took refuge on the continent, imbibed the principles of the Geneva school, and when they returned to their native country they brought these principles along with them.

When Elizabeth ascended the throne, it is not to be wondered at, that a scene considerably troubled and irregular should succeed. The Romanists struggled hard to retain the ascendancy. The Protestants laboured with equal ardour to restore their religion. The Queen had to act an important, but difficult part. About the time of the death of Queen Mary, a number of Bishops died, so that there were only fifteen Sees filled when Elizabeth began to reign. Of the Bishops, none but Kitcher of Landaff, would take the oath of supremacy. It was also refused by about two hundred of the other clergy. So that there were more vacancies than it was easy to fill with suitable characters. Many of the exiles were preferred in the Church; some of whom were considerably tainted with the peculiarities of Geneva. To preserve peace and uniformity among such, was found to be difficult; and it was not long till some of them were ejected for their intemperate proceedings. Still, until after the return of Cartwright from Geneva, there was no serious opposition to Episcopacy.

To argue from acknowledged irregularities is surely unfair. And yet the only proof that you have of your grand position, that the English Reformers were Presbyterians in principle, arises from a few immature opinions, at the very dawning of the Reformation, and a few irregularities in disorderly times. They might with as much ease prove that the Reformers in Scotland were Episcopalians in principle.

Most of the irregularities in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, took place under Archbishop Grindal. Old and easily influ-

enced, this Prelate had suffered the Church to be considerably injured, in more respects than one. But his successor, Archbishop Whitgift, pious, firm, and wise, possessing a degree of vigilance that never slumbered, rescued her from the dangers with which she was threatened.

Passing on from irregularities, you come to the Canons of the Church. The 55th Canon requires the ministers of the Church "to pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." The very same canon also requires them to pray for Archbishops and Bishops, as other Pastors and Curates. Now, if this amount to a proof, that the Church of Scotland was regularly constituted in the opinion of Episcopalians, it must also prove, that the Church of England was not: for two things materially different cannot be *equally* right. But I should rather suppose, that it could not be admitted to imply any such thing. If I remember rightly, I think I heard Presbyterians pray for all denominations of Christians, or rather perhaps, Protestants, for I believe the petition generally went, as to Roman Catholics, to *break down anti-christian tyranny, as well as Mahometan delusion*. But I never concluded, that this implied a belief on their part, that all Christian denominations were Presbyterians.

The position, "that Archbishop Bancroft was the first man in the Church of England who preached up the divine right of Episcopacy," stands exactly upon the same foundation with your doctrine. A considerable time before the sermon, containing the assertion in question, was preached, the Church had been fixed upon Episcopal principles in her Liturgy, in her Articles, and in her Ordinal. Now, it might have been said, that she did not maintain the divine right of Presbyters with as much truth, as that of Bishops. For after her wisest and most learned divines had completed the reformation with a single view to the Scriptures and to the primitive Church, and fixed the ministry with three distinct grades, having three separate offices of ordination, to say that in part of this arrangement, they consulted mere expediency, would be to charge them with holding a language which they did not believe, and with neglecting standards which they professed to regard. But on this score we are com-

pletely relieved from the painful necessity of imputing any thing disingenuous to the English Reformers, by testimony sufficiently abundant for fair and unprejudiced inquiry.

The Reformation in Scotland was of foreign extraction. Its principal abetter was John Knox, a disciple of the Geneva school. He was a man of an ardent temper, and of impetuous and intemperate zeal; qualities by no means propitious to correct thinking, or to the establishment of well matured plans. The great object of his efforts appeared to be, to settle things on the Geneva model. Yet he did not live to see this effected. His successor, Andrew Melvil, a man very much of the same stamp, was also a disciple of the same school. He, after various defeats, aided by the ardor of some of the nobility to share in the spoils of the Church, at last accomplished his object. But even his plan was established contrary to the approbation of some of the most wise and pious divines of the country.* He was encouraged and urged on by Beza, and his system was truly copied from the Geneva form. The latter of these Reformers fixed the mode of Presbyterian ordination; but the former seems to have had little apprehension of the true and primitive form of ordination, for he rejected the *imposition of hands* altogether.† These divines of the Geneva college were greatly aided in promoting their views by the state of the country, as to civil affairs. The young Queen, educated at the court of France, was in many respects unacceptable to her Scotch subjects; and a dislike to her was, by a little art, easily converted into a dislike to her religion. Besides, fanaticism, an irresistible engine, with an illiterate and superstitious people, was also used with great effect. The fervid and impassioned declamation, that was uttered against every thing *Popish*, urged the people to make not a *reformation*, but a total *change* of all things. And how easily this is accomplished among a people, feeling sore under the former state of things, we have had ample proof, even in the enlightened eighteenth century.

These things being duly considered, and you, Sir, have compelled us to bring them into view, little reliance will be placed on the Reformation in Scotland, as yielding either a specimen of moderation or correctness. Yet through all the ebul-

* See Collier's Hist. part ii. p. 574.

† Ibidem, p. 468.

litions of these troubled times, we find a distinction preserved between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy. The case of Lamb, Spotswood and Hamilton, in point of fact, is as you state it. They were Presbyterian ministers; and Bishop Andrews objected to their consecration, until they had gone through the inferior grades of Deacon and Priest. Archbishop Bancroft overruled this objection; but, as we are informed by Heylin, upon the principle, that the Episcopal character could be fully conveyed by a single consecration. And for this he cited some precedents from antiquity. In the year 1661, when Episcopacy was established a second time, *J. Sharpe, Hamilton, Fairful, and Leighton*, all Presbyterian ministers, were consecrated Bishops, in London, not however until they were first ordained Deacons and Priests. And from these, has been continued in regular succession the present Scotch Episcopal Church.*

How then, Sir, you could hazard the declaration, that, "if there be any fact in the history of the British Churches capable of being demonstrated, it is, that these venerable Reformers uniformly acknowledged the other protestant churches formed on the Presbyterian plan to be sound members of the Universal Church," is to me surprising. After we have seen the English Reformers fixing their standards upon this acknowledged principle, *that Episcopacy was of divine origin*; after we have found them resisting every attempt to introduce the Geneva plan; after we have heard the most celebrated historians declare, that the Presbyterian Church was *irregularly* constituted, and in an *imperfect state*; after we have beheld persons going from Scotland to London to obtain correct Episcopal orders; we must be permitted to regard your declaration as totally destitute of proof, nay, in direct opposition to the opinions and the acts of the English Reformers.

We readily admit, that the Lutheran Church is not Episcopal. But we could adduce a variety of circumstances to show, that it was owing to necessity, as they believed, that Episcopacy was not continued. Dr. Mosheim, an historian of their own, speaking of those who ardently wished for a reformation in the Church, says, "they did not extend their views so far as a change in the form of ecclesiastical government." "All they aimed

* See *Swords's* edition of Skinner's *Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated*, p. 266.

at was to set limits to the overgrown power of the Pontiffs," &c. vol. iv. p. 27. The Reformers on the continent then, it seems, had no view to abolish a simple Episcopacy; but being obliged to organize themselves on some plan or other, and having no Bishops, they imagined that the necessity of their case would justify their conduct. And what they did by necessity, their successors defended as of divine right.

They were, however, so far from embracing, as you say, *ministerial parity*, that they have left on record a proof, at least many of them, that when a genuine Episcopacy cannot be attained, something approaching as near to it as can be, is looked upon as the best. In arguing with you, it seems necessary often to bring to view the nature of ministerial parity. For although you have attempted to prove that there was but one *order* in the primitive Church, yet churches that have two orders, and are in a variety of other respects organized on a plan different from your's, you claim as recognizing your principles. That the Lutheran Church was correctly organized, you have not been able to adduce a single opinion even of her own divines of that time. And it was certainly the belief of the English Reformers, and has been that of her best divines ever since, that she was in an imperfect state. And still we are told, that she receded equally as far from Presbyterianism on the one hand, as from Episcopacy on the other; and instead of Bishops, appointed *superintendants*. Now, I think it is a fair presumption, that when she deemed such a plan wise and expedient, if she could have had it upon divine authority, she would have preferred it. And that some of the Lutheran Churches have now Bishops is undeniable, though I am unable to say whether their Episcopacy be regular.

The churches in Sweden and in Denmark, we are told by Dr. Mosheim, retained the form of ecclesiastical government which preceded the Reformation, purged indeed from the superstition and abuses that rendered it so odious. It is true, you have controverted this opinion, but you have produced no authority, and, consequently, it will be deemed still safe, to rely upon the information of this learned historian.

Geneva was the only soil that produced genuine parity. Nor was it easy to find other lands, in which this new plant would grow. Zuingli commenced the Reformation in Switzerland.

He admitted different ranks and orders among the ministers of the Gospel. After his time, a new system was advocated by Calvin, which he at last carried into effect. His learning and zeal raised his reputation, so that persons from various countries visited Geneva, and imbibed his doctrines. By these means, in Scotland, Holland, and France, the disciples of Calvin propagated his doctrine. And yet in these countries, the Presbyterian Churches differ considerably. In the Church of Holland, we are informed by Dr. Maclaine, they have clerical Deacons, a form of prayer, and they observe the festivals.

So far is it then from being true that the Reformers embraced your doctrine of parity, that the reverse seems nearly to be the case. We have found the Reformers beginning with the avowed intention of not touching the Episcopacy, but of removing abuses in other respects. We have found, that in those countries where the clergy were at liberty to act without restraint, Episcopacy was preserved. We have found that the Lutherans, although they could not continue the Episcopacy, fixed a form of government very much similar in practice. And we have also found, that only one solitary Reformer fixed his Church on a different foundation, although he had influence enough, through his followers, to impose his plan upon other countries.

If then, Sir, you had submitted your cause to be tried by the Reformers, which you disavow, you would have certainly been defeated.

With the Reformers you have thought fit to connect the Methodists. They do, it is true, "call themselves Episcopalians; but this is a thing of very recent date." And I should have imagined, that it could not have been unknown to you, that we did not admit the validity of their Episcopacy.

To an attentive observer of what has passed in England, and in this country, with respect to the Methodists, for a few years back, it must be evident, that they have never acted upon any system for a length of time. Nothing, I believe, was farther from the intentions of their founder than that they should become a new sect of Presbyterians. They, as themselves declared, only wished "to build up the Church of England." Still, in extreme old age, Mr. John Wesley yielded to the importunity of his preachers; and, although a Presbyterian, founded an

Episcopacy. He did not indeed claim the Episcopal authority, for he said Lord King had convinced him, that Bishop and Presbyterian were the same in the primitive Church. Still he instituted an Episcopal form of government, with three distinct orders, and three distinct offices of ordination. His Episcopacy, then, being irregular, may be called human, and not divine. And still this yields a proof that the Episcopal form of government is a wise and excellent one, and gives no small degree of superiority and consolation to those who derive it regular from Christ himself.

His followers, as is often the case, have taken a different ground. They strenuously defend the divine origin of Episcopacy, and precisely and unequivocally disavow the doctrine of Parity. But they admit the right of breaking the succession, or forming a new Church at discretion.* Many who have joined the Methodists could never have been induced to have done so, if they had been avowed Presbyterians. And I do know that hundreds of them suppose their Church to be a true Episcopal Church.



(N. B. The 7th Letter appeared in the Magazine for July and August.)

LETTER VIII.

The Rise and Progress of Prelacy.

The origin of Episcopacy dated a hundred years earlier by some Presbyterians than by Dr. Miller. It implied a radical change in the fundamental arrangements of the Polity of the Church, and, of course, could not have been effected without notice. Dr. Miller's arguments stated—1st. That such a change was likely to happen. 2d. That as great changes did happen without notice. And, 3d. That such a change did actually happen. His first principle, the love of pre-eminence, the ground of the Episcopal argument. Miller confuted by Campbell, who ascribes the origin of Episcopacy to virtue. Miller's instances not to the point, in as much as some of them can be easily traced,

* See Notes on their Doctrines and Discipline, by Coke and Ashbury, tenth edition.

and others are not parallel. The proofs that a change did take place examined and confuted. The steps by which it advanced confused, unnatural, and controverted by some well known and admitted facts. No satisfactory account given of any change.

REV. SIR,

IF it could be proved that Episcopacy commenced after the time of the Apostles, we would readily admit that it stood upon human authority, no matter when it was introduced. But in a controversy on this subject, it is of considerable importance, what time our opponents assign for its commencement. If it be maintained, that a considerable time elapsed before the change from Presbyterianism to Episcopacy took place, it must seem wonderful, that there should be any difficulty in ascertaining what kind of government prevailed during that time. If the government of the Church was Presbyterian, as you contend for, during no less a period than two hundred years, it must appear strange, that the histories of so long a period should not distinctly mark its principal and distinguishing arrangements. Nor is this all; three learned advocates for Parity, *Blondel*, *Bochart*, and *Salmasius*, allow Episcopacy to have been the established government of the Church about forty years after the time of the Apostles. You say, Episcopacy commenced about the close of the second century. Now, there is about a hundred years of the age of the Church, when, according to those authors, the government was Episcopal, but, according to you, Presbyterian. Does not this amount to a proof, that there is an unaccountable difference between you, as to the meaning of those authors from whom you derive your knowledge of the government of the Church, for this period? This has really the appearance of your system standing upon *human ingenuity*.

It ought to be kept in mind, that the difference between Episcopacy and your system does not consist in a few minute and unimportant particulars, but in all the principal arrangements, functions, and offices of the Church. No two forms of civil polity can, more distinctly or more materially differ. Episcopacy embraces three regular *orders*, with separate ordinations; Deacons, Priests, and Bishops. These possess different powers and

perform different offices. They advance by regular gradations, the Deacons being the first order, to which young men are admitted ; then the Priests, who perform the most ordinary ministerial duties ; and, last of all, the Bishops, who have to guard the entrance to the ministry, and to transmit the commission of our blessed Lord. Your system comprises only *one* order, to which are committed all powers and all duties without discrimination. Now, "*that the latter system should have been changed for the former, without opposition, without noise, without leaving in the records of antiquity one single trace of the steps by which the time when, or the agents by whom, it was effected, is indeed incredible, nay impossible.*"

Here it is to be observed, that we do not pronounce it improbable, far less impossible, that such a change should have taken place. This is not our position. But that it should have happened, and *not a single notice of it be found in the history of the Church*, is what we cannot credit. Nor does it affect our doctrine, whether it be said to have taken place gradually or all at once. If it began, for instance, at Jerusalem, so entire a change, however much for the better, would have excited much attention, been viewed differently by different persons, and opposed by some, if approved by others. And could all this have passed away without any record ? If it be alleged to have crept in by small and imperceptible degrees, its very nature excludes the possibility of this, for it implied the raising of some, in rank and power, above others ; a thing that never happened without opposition and without noise. If it was effected by a general understanding among Christians, how was this ascertained ? It must have been by some council, some meeting, or some convention of the Church. And is it credible that such a council should have been held, such a decree passed, without a single record to preserve its memory ?

So strong is this point, and so easy to be understood, that I am fully persuaded it could hardly be presented to the understanding of any man, not pledged to support some other system, without operating entire belief. And yet in the view of Dr. Miller, it seems *scarcely specious*, for the following reasons, viz. "*that considering the character and circumstances of the Church, from the close of the second to the beginning of the fourth century, nothing was more likely to happen than such an*

usurpation and change as are here supposed ; that changes quite as inconsistent with primitive purity, and quite as likely to excite opposition and noise, are acknowledged on all hands, actually to have taken place during that period, without our being able to find in the records of antiquity, any distinct account of the manner in which they were introduced ; and that, notwithstanding every plausible theory to the contrary, there is abundant evidence, that the precise change which our opponents pronounce impossible, did in fact gradually gain admittance into the Church after the close of the second century, and produced an important revolution in its aspect and government." Page 288.

In attempting to substantiate these propositions, you set out with the principle, " that the desire of pre-eminence and power is natural to man." Here I wonder you did not perceive, how strongly this principle operates against your theory. Its general admission surely destroys your doctrine. For your doctrine would require some to be fond of power, and others not ; some to be ambitious, and others tame and submissive ; some to be fond of pre-eminence, and others to yield it without a murmur. Nor do I think you could have quoted instances, when fairly taken, more decidedly to our purpose, than the two brought from Scripture. The ambitious claim of the sons of Zebedee did not pass without notice. " When the ten heard it, they began to be much displeased with James and John." *Mark* x. 41. And, on the other occasion, the desire of distinction occasioned a *strife*. " There was a *strife* among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest." *Luke* xxii. 24. The claims of some were resisted by others. And this is really human nature. These are the notices of an inspired historian, who had no view but to support the truth. And if St. Paul, as you say, had to struggle with the ambitious pretensions of some ministers in his time, is it not likely, that such ambitious pretensions would always have occasioned a *struggle* ? Thus then, confining ourselves to the pure and primitive history of the Church, we find instances exactly corresponding with our principles ; we find the most feeble attempts at superiority instantly resisted ; we find the very dawning efforts of change immediately arrested. Is it then credible that a great and universal change should have been accomplished without a single intimation of it remaining on record ?

Your *theory*, which makes Episcopacy the offspring of ambition, requires you to place its origin in corrupted times. But the learned and acute Dr. Campbell ascribes it, not to the *ambition* but to the *virtue* of the Clergy; and, of course, its beginning, according to him, was in the days of purity. I must confess, that his reasoning, in my view, is more ingenious than your's. "I am far from thinking," says he, "that the ambition or the vices of the first ministers gave rise to their authority. I am certain, that this effect is much more justly ascribed to their virtues. An aspiring disposition rouses jealousy; jealousy puts people on their guard."* This I offer as a complete refutation of your theory, from an eminent Presbyterian. I also claim it as a proof, that such a conflict could never have passed away without notice in corrupted times. To confute Dr. Campbell's theory it is only necessary to show, that there never was a time when the ministers of the Church had so completely renovated human nature, as to yield to claims of superiority without opposition. The instances from Scripture already mentioned are to this point.

If Dr. Campbell could have seen a simple but regular Episcopacy in the primitive Church; if he could have discerned that the Apostles had no extraordinary ministry, but extraordinary powers or gifts; if he could have perceived, that the arrangements of the Church in her infancy and settled state differed in things quite unconnected with the orders and offices of the ministry; if he could have admitted, that Timothy and Titus possessed all rights of the Apostolic Order, his principle would have been strictly applicable to the progress of the innovations and additions that in process of time were ingrafted upon the original stock. "Let it be observed," says he, "that I have all along admitted an original distinction, which, though very different from that which in process of time obtained, served for a foundation to the edifice."† Unable to account for such an entire change in the polity of the Church, as from a ministry of one order to one of three, he supposes that some kind of distinction existed from the beginning. This, in my opinion, adds strength to the Episcopal cause, in as much as there is no way in which the most ingenious and able advocates

* Campbell's Lectures, vol. i. page 181. American edition.

† Campbell's Lectures, vol. i. p. 181

of Presbyterianism can account for the subsequent form of polity in the Church, but upon the supposition, that it had a foundation similar to Episcopacy.

One more observation occurs upon this subject. The effects that Dr. Miller ascribes to vice, Dr. Campbell ascribes to virtue. Dr. Miller says the Church was *exceedingly* corrupted when Episcopacy began; Dr. Campbell alleges, it was *exceedingly* pure. Dr. Campbell avows that there was some kind of distinction among the ministers from the beginning; Dr. Miller avers that there was not. Does not all this look more like works of fancy, than a serious investigation into historical truth?

In the ignorance of the people of those nations over which Christianity spread itself, during the three first centuries, you find a ground of belief, that such a change could have been effected. In ignorance and in knowledge, there will generally be a certain proportion between the people and their governors, whether civil or religious. But the present question can be little affected by the supposition that at this particular period the Clergy had gone farther beyond the people in knowledge than usual. The Clergy were principally interested in such a change. Of this you are so well aware, that you have made them yield to a few domineering spirits among their brethren, without a murmur. And is it really true, that the ambitious and the submissive were so exactly proportioned, that among the multitude of Clergy at Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria and Carthage, there were only four so aspiring as to rise above their equals? Is it really true, that none were disappointed in their hopes of preferment? And was there not a single honest minister remaining to resist an unchristian innovation?

But, it seems, it was gradually done. Well, suppose it began at Jerusalem. Suppose a President or Moderator in this city first began to take out of the hands of the Presbytery the right of ordination, and all the other Presbyters, wicked as you say they were, tamely submitted. Can it be imagined, that such an innovation would excite no wonder at Rome, or Antioch, or Alexandria? While we have particular accounts of controversies occasioned by things far less important, is it no wonder that this passed in silence? Nor could you well have selected instances less to the point than the restoration of Charles II. the elevation of Buonaparte, and the subjugation of Holland. Who,

Sir, could believe, that these events will ever be omitted or blotted out in history? I must confess, however, that I have not penetration enough to see any resemblance in these cases. The English, after experiencing the intolerance and despotism of a fanatic band of usurpers, hailed with joy, the return of their legitimate sovereign. The poor deluded French, after passing through scenes of unexampled misery and distress, yielded to the yoke of an ambitious and successful commander. The Dutch, torn by faction, and subdued by intrigue, received a king from the hand of a military despot. The circumstances leading to these events, the principal actors, and the great features of change, are minutely marked. But of your alleged change in the government of the Church, no historian has left us a single circumstance.

Your next "*step*" is an induction of instances of such "corruption, and clerical domination," as you say, *in fact*, did take place. Admitting all this to be exactly so, the only safe and legitimate inference is, that others *might* also have taken place, but not that they actually *did* take place. It does not follow, that two things equally probable did really happen, but that they might have happened.

1. Your first instance is *the administering of the Lord's Supper to infants*. This practice, it is admitted by several historians, prevailed in the second century. A satisfactory reason is assigned for its introduction. The receiving of the Sacrament was considered as essential to salvation, and of course it was administered to infants. Its introduction might have occasioned a controversy, or it might not. At any rate it cannot be deemed a case similar to the one in question. There was no usurpation of power, no encroachment upon the rights of others; there was nothing to interest the passions and feelings of the Clergy. It was neither the degradation of some, nor the elevation of others. Among persons holding the opinion just mentioned, it would pass on as a matter of course.

2. Your next instance is the appointment of metropolitans. No arrangement in the Church is easier to be traced than this. It began with councils. The Bishop of the Metropolis was made president of the council. In process of time he acquired the power of convening councils. But even this was by no means a general usage in the Church. In some churches the

senior Bishop presided. But what resemblance does this bear to your supposed beginning of Episcopacy? There was no *new order* created; there was no right filched out of the hands of other Bishops. The metropolitan never seized upon the right of ordination. Nor was there any material difference between him and the presiding Bishops in our American conventions.

3. Nor is it less easy to trace the progress of Papacy. It originated in a deference paid to the Bishop of Rome, that city being the seat of civil government for a great many centuries. But even the Bishop of Rome never effected such a usurpation as would have been implied in a change from Parity to Episcopacy. He never ventured to exclude other Bishops from the right of ordaining and confirming. Indeed, for a considerable time he possessed nothing more than mere presidency.

4. As to the mode of *electing* and *installing* ministers, some of the most learned of your own divines, differ in opinion. Dr. Campbell says, "from Scripture we have not sufficient ground for concluding positively on either side." Now, Sir, before you had assumed this, as an instance to your purpose, you ought to have been sure that it was well substantiated. Nay, it is most safe and most fair, to argue from generally admitted principles. To take it for granted that our own points are proved, and then use them as given, is an easy mode of arguing. Besides, it ought to be remembered that our adversaries are entitled to the same privilege.

5. Availing myself of this privilege, I dismiss the case of your Ruling *Elders*, believing that I have proved no such officers ever existed in the Church.

Thus then stands your instances of departure from primitive purity. Some of them are easily traced in the history of the Church, some of them have no affinity to the case under consideration, and some of them are admitted by Presbyterians themselves never to have prevailed. It will indeed, Sir, require something more to the point in order to satisfy the inquiring mind on such a subject as this; some account of this great change in history; some footsteps by which we may follow it. It was calculated to excite the passions, to interest the feelings, and to rouse the concern of both good and bad men. But you think it by no means "wonderful that we find so little said concerning these usurpations in the early records of antiquity." Page

302. "There was *probably* but little written on the subject, and *probably* that little was lost." *Probably* there was a good deal written, and *probably* all that was written would not have been lost. And my *probability* stands, I think, upon a better ground than yours. For I find in Scripture a particular account of attempts at pre-eminence, and what opposition they occasioned. And there is at least one case upon record after the apostolic times, that entirely corresponds with my principle. I mean the case of *Ærius*.

If it were true, that Episcopacy did not exist in the Apostolic Church, but was unquestionably the form of government about two hundred years after, it would follow, that a change must have taken place, whether any account of this change was to be found in history or not. But it would be admitted to be so extraordinary a thing, that it would very justly give rise to a variety of inquiries. Is it certain that Episcopacy did obtain in the third century? Yes. In this all agree. Are no traces of a change to be found in the history of the Church? In this too, our most candid adversaries meet us. And is it also agreed, that nothing like Episcopacy is to be found in the history of the Apostolic Church? By no means. We think we perceive distinctly the outlines of a simple and pure Episcopacy in the sacred volume; and, in the history of the succeeding period, we find strong confirmation of this opinion. But our opponents deny this, and maintain that Parity prevailed. The two first positions then, being so well established, there is room to suspect that as to the third there must be some mistake. For it being granted that Episcopacy did prevail in the third century, and there being no account of its commencement, I should conclude, that it prevailed from the beginning.

This, Sir, I really consider as one of those bulwarks around Episcopacy which its enemies will never be able to shake.

Your ground is perfectly untenable; except on the supposition that the proof of *parity* in the Apostolic Church is so clear and so decided as to unite the judgments of all who have investigated the subject. But taking all the Christians together that ever have or do now exist, those on your side, compared to those on ours, are but like a grain of sand to a vast mountain.

Unwilling then, as you well might be, to hazard your cause upon this foundation, you go on to adduce proofs, that such a

change did take place. And, according to the usual course of things, how should we imagine it was effected, and what kind of proof have we a right to look for? If the original government was found to be a bad one, should we not expect it to be changed by some solemn, deliberate act of the Church? If the change was for the worse, and accomplished by wickedness, by whom was it effected? By one or by a number of ambitious Priests, in Jerusalem, in Rome, in Alexandria, or in Carthage? No, you have been able to find nothing of all this. Your proofs are quite of a different kind.

1. Your first arises from a "comparison of the general language of Scripture and the writers of the first two centuries, concerning Bishops, with the general language used on the same subject in the fourth century." Page 303. We have always admitted, that the terms Bishop and Presbyter are indiscriminately used for the same order in Scripture; but we contend, that the Apostles were superior to this order, and that a provision was made for the continuance of this superior order, in the ordination of Timothy and Titus. So evident is the superiority of Timothy and Titus over common Presbyters, that some of your Presbyterian brethren have admitted it, and resorted to this poor expedient, that this was not to be a permanent arrangement in the Church. You have precluded yourself from this advantage, by admitting "that Christians are bound to make the Apostolic order of the Church their model." We do, however, deny, and we believe we have shown good cause for denial, that the same indiscriminate use of titles continued for two centuries. With this you were so hard puzzled, that you had to make the Bishops sometimes *Moderators*, and sometimes *Presidents*. We should have placed little reliance upon the use of terms, had we not seen in the Fathers distinct functions, duties, and officers attached to particular titles. And I should have been glad, that you had pointed out the difference between the *early* and the *later* Fathers in distinguishing the orders of the ministry. An appeal to others, Sir, is not admissible, while we have the writings of these Fathers before us.

2. That Episcopacy commenced after the Apostolic age, you think, may be established by the declaration of several approved writers, who lived near the time when this took place. The authors on which you depend for proof of this, have been already

considered in my fifth Letter. Of these St. Jerome is your chief dependence. And, I think, the impartial reader will admit, that so scanty, so vague, and so contradictory is his testimony, that it amounts to nothing. It is amusing to see what difficulties they who rely on Jerome have to encounter. It is asserted by the Editor of the *Christians's Magazine*, that agreeably to Jerome's account, the Presbyters of Alexandria ordained their Bishop.* Now, this was some kind of new ordination, for he was a Presbyter before. And when did this practice obtain? Why, from the time of Mark. It was not an Episcopal ordination, it is true, because it was performed by Presbyters. It could not be the mere appointment of a President, because, you say, it was towards the close of the first century before even "a temporary *Chairman* was necessary." Page 322. This seems strange! Why, Dr. Miller, Dr. Mason, and St. Jerome, all at variance!

3. It is true, that diocesan Episcopacy first prevailed in large cities, but it prevailed from the beginning. We have extant, lists of Bishops in Jerusalem, Rome, &c. from the time of the Apostles. But, you say, it was from one to two hundred years before it extended to all the country churches. This must then have reached near to the time of St. Jerome. And if it was the object of this Father to prove Parity to have been the divine form of church government, would it not have been more to his purpose, to have told where it then existed, or had lately expired, than any thing he has said? Is it likely that a man of his ardent temper would have satisfied himself with bare hints and allusions, when he might have described the origin and progress of a change so lately completed? And yet, of all this, we find nothing in St. Jerome. Besides, if such a difference existed in the government of the Church for a century and more, if Episcopacy prevailed in cities and Presbyterianism in country places, does it not exceed belief, that no contention, no inquiry, no controversy should have been excited on the subject, so as to leave some notices of it in the history of the Church?

4. Your next resort is to the "*decrees of the early councils concerning Bishops.*" These, you say, "clearly evince, that such a change as you have supposed really took place," because

* Vol. ii. No. iii. page 349.

they show, "that constant provision was made for gradually extending the power of the Bishops." And is such a gradual extension of power a proof of a change in the fundamental arrangements of government? Were the power of the President of the United States to be gradually extended, till he became as despotic as Buonaparte, would this be considered as a proof, that once there was no president? During the three first centuries there were few councils, and these few were of little consequence, except the two councils of Antioch, in which the Bishop of that city, *Paul Samosatenus*, was tried. Nor during this period are there any canons or decrees to be found, in which any alteration is made, as to the power or jurisdiction of Bishops. And yet this is the very time when, as you allege, a radical change in the polity of the Church took place. Still, while there were some councils, in which was discussed, when *Easter* should be celebrated, whether Heretics should be re-baptized, not a word was said about vesting the power of ordination exclusively in the Bishops. Had this been an innovation in the Church, should we not have heard something about it? We would advise persons to read the decrees of the early councils, not fearing but the result would be favourable to Episcopacy. The decrees to which you refer are of a much later date than the end of the second century. The Council of Sardis, in which it was decreed, that no more Bishops should be ordained for small towns, was held about the middle of the fourth century; and the Council of Ancyra about thirty years sooner. Were we to receive your sense of the thirteenth canon of this council, it would admit no question, that city Presbyters then exercised the right of ordination. But we must be permitted to examine the canon itself. It stands thus: "*It is not lawful for suffragan Bishops to ordain Priests or Deacons, nor for the city Presbyters in another parish without the permission of their Bishop.*" If the verb *ordain*, is to be understood as applied to city Presbyters, the meaning would clearly be, that although they withdrew the right of ordination from suffragan Bishops, they continued it to city Presbyters, provided they would confine the exercise of this right to their own parishes. Now, agreeably to your hypothesis, the Bishops in cities had usurped the right of ordination more than a hundred years before. This then is at variance with your doctrine. And it is equally so with ours,

for we contend that Presbyters never did ordain. There is evidently some word omitted here, such as "*to act.*" It would then stand—*nor for the city Presbyters to act in another Parish, &c.* And this corresponds with the opinion of some of the best critics, and is found so in the code of the Roman Church.

5. Nor is your next proof more applicable or more conclusive. It is the gradual diminution of the number of Bishops after the three first centuries. Would not the enlargement of dioceses equally well account for this? And what evidence can the diminution of the number of Bishops be that a change was effected in the polity of the Church, when this did not take place till a hundred years after the change? Indeed, Sir, I wonder you were not afraid of betraying the weakness of your cause, by resorting to such remote and inapplicable arguments as these.

Finally: The last argument in proof of your position is drawn from the opinion of "*the most learned and impartial historians, and other competent judges of modern times.*"

The first historian whom you quote is Dr. Mosheim. He is admitted to be a learned, and, in general, a good historian. But his account of the primitive Church has been deliberately rejected by the Episcopal Church of America.* To balance the matter with you, I offer Eusebius. In the opinion of Mosheim, he was "a man of immense reading, and justly famous for his profound knowledge of Ecclesiastical history.† He lived in the fourth century, some time before St. Jerome, and nearer the time assigned by you for this great change. Still he has not the most distant allusion to such an event. He gives a list of the Bishops in the principal cities, from the time of the Apostles. He uniformly mentions the outward form of the Church, such as that for which we contend, and no traces of Presbyterianism are to be found in him.

Your next historian is Mr. Gibbon. The attentive reader of Mr. Gibbon's works and life, will clearly perceive a strong and predominant bias upon his mind against Christianity. He seems to have expected, that the delusive garb of a flowery and exuberant style would conceal from many, the insidious attacks

* See "Course of Ecclesiastical Studies established by the House of Bishops, in Convention, 1804.

† Mosheim, vol. i. p. 357.

made upon the religion of Christ. And he expresses some degree of disappointment, that his views were so clearly seen. But you say, "the subject before us is a question of *fact*, which he treats historically;" and is not the divine origin of Christianity a matter of fact? And what confidence can be placed in the man, who ascribes its origin and progress to human device and human means? Mr. Gibbon, as was to be expected, makes the government of the Church the contrivance of man. And although he adopts the opinion of equality among the ministers, yet he asserts, that this was so feeble and inadequate a government, that Episcopacy was devised as far superior. "The advantages of this Episcopal form of government, which appears to have been introduced before the end of the first century, were so obvious, and so important for the future greatness, as well as present peace of Christianity, that it was adopted, without delay, by all the societies that were already scattered over the empire; had acquired, in a very early period, the sanction of antiquity, and is still revered by the most powerful churches, both of the East and of the West, as a primitive, and even as a divine establishment."* This sentence stands in the middle of one of your quotations, and yet it seems you deemed it prudent to omit it. It certainly exhibits you and your historian at variance in one material point, the time when Episcopacy began. There is a whole century of difference between your learned and correct Gibbon and yourself. Besides, if his testimony could be relied upon, it adds little to that of Mosheim, for, by his own acknowledgment, he copied from him. "In the history of the Christian hierarchy," says he, "I have, for the most part, followed the learned and candid Mosheim."†

As to Dr. Haweis, I have already observed, that, as an historian, he is held in no estimation by churchmen. And, for my own part, I cannot place confidence in a man, who, at the same time that he holds a rich living in the Church, and has subscribed the thirty-nine Articles, *ex animo*, is still ready to join her enemies in any clamour against her, and has espoused doctrines diametrically opposite to her's: for I hold it impossible for any conscientious man to subscribe the Articles unless he be an Episcopalian. I am sorry to find in Dr. Haweis a disposition

* Gibbon's Roman Empire, vol. ii. p. 329.

† Ibidem, p. 330.

to degrade and depress the Church, while he delights to bestow praise, indiscriminately, upon the Dissenters.*

In the opposite scale to Dr. Haweis' history, I would place Dr. Gregory's. And if you had named any other, I think it probable I should have been able to produce one equally as good. I have already reduced you to Dr. Mosheim, as an historian of reputation, and shown strong grounds of belief, that his account of the primitive Church is not correct. I could also, I imagine, equal your professor Whitaker both in learning and authority. Either *Andrews*, *Wilson*, or *Horsley*, would answer this purpose; and these held the divine origin of Episcopacy.

These then are the proofs upon which you depend to substantiate the important *fact*, that a total change took place in the Christian ministry about the close of the second century; *the vague and variable use of language, one or two dark allusions of a single author, some changes which took place in the extent of dioceses as the Church became established, and the opinion of an anti-Episcopal writer, a deistical historian, and an inconsistent and incorrect churchman.* This change is mentioned by no historian of the time; it is preserved by no record of the Church; it is neither spoken of, nor alluded to in any decree of a council; nor is there a single circumstance to show where or when it began, how it proceeded, or by whom it was effected. On the other hand, the orders of the ministry, which we contend for, are mentioned by the Fathers, as existing in their time; the records of the Church, as preserved by a learned historian, who lived near the time assigned for the change, mark the government as Episcopal from the beginning; and it is easy to trace, in the decrees of councils, and in the works of divines, how, from the foundation of a simple Episcopacy, the edifice rose to the Roman Hierarchy. Every step then that the churchman advances his confidence strengthens, and his belief becomes more and more impregnable.

Having now discharged your proofs of the *fact*, that the change in question did take place, we will still follow, with patience, those who have *most deeply and most successfully explored*

* The partiality and incorrectness of Dr. Haweis' history are extremely well exposed in a *Review* annexed to the American edition of Skinner's *Primitive Truth and Order*, published by T. & J. Swords, New-York.

antiquity, through the steps by which they say this remarkable usurpation proceeded.

In Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Corinth, and in Rome, you admit, there were so many converts, that there must have been a number of congregations in each; that in every one of these congregations there was one or more teaching Elders or Bishops; that among these ministers there was not even a President till towards the close of the first century; that about that time they began to have a Chairman or Moderator, and that this parochial or congregational court conferred HOLY ORDERS. This is your first STEP in the rise of Prelacy.

Then the Bishops or Elders of one city began to hold meetings to transact business, as the exigences of the Church required. At these meetings it grew into practice to choose a President also. This is your second step.

In some places, it seems, there was originally but one Pastor, and when the Christians increased he received several assistants; that he was considered as Rector, and the rest Curates, or they stood much in the same relation. This authority of one Pastor over several proved a third step.

These then are the gradations by which you think Prelacy advanced. Let us carefully examine them. They seem, however, very unnatural and unconnected. How did the business advance? Did the President of the parish first usurp the right of ordination, for instance, and then transmit it to the city Presbyters, and they again resign it into the hands of their President? And how did this proceed so as to reach the Rectors? I wish those who have deeply and successfully explored antiquity had told us something about all this.

There are some well attested facts, that seem to militate against this scheme. It must be remembered that you say, "there was complete equality among the ministers of Christ, without even precedency in their meetings, for some time after the Apostles. The first fact in opposition to this is, that in the Acts of the Apostles we evidently find St. James holding a superiority over the Elders. Timothy and Titus were vested with power to ordain and to superintend the conduct of Presbyters. And Eusebius furnishes lists of the Bishops in Jerusalem, Rome, &c. from the time of the Apostles. This is so unquestionable a truth, that some Presbyterians have been unable to

evade it, but by admitting a Presidency from the beginning. Agreeably to your plan, there was no President, no Moderator, for some time in any of the cities. Then there was a President or Moderator for every congregation. After a while, there was only one President or one Moderator for each city; and he, as you suppose, was styled the Bishop of the city in which he resided. Before this then, there were either no Bishops or a number in every city. But where do we hear of there being more Bishops than one in Jerusalem, in Ephesus? &c.

“The progress of the Church,” you say, “towards Prelacy, was further aided by the practice of convening *Synods* and *Councils*,” because they gave rise to *Metropolitans*. Now, Sir, I should consider this as a proof, that Prelacy was then in existence: for a Metropolitan is nothing more than a *chief* among Bishops. And even Dr. Mosheim is so far from considering this as giving rise to Episcopacy, that it only augmented the power and authority of the Bishops. Vol. i. p. 178. Besides, the *Metropolitans* never wrested from the hands of common Bishops the right of *ordination*. Their superiority consisted in precedence in councils at first, and then, under Constantine, in the superintendence of the Bishops of their several provinces.

Your *steps* then, Sir, seem to be entirely fallacious. They mark no radical change in the polity of the Church; but while some of them are not to be found at all, others only designate those gradations by which the Church, in a long series of years, rose from a simple Episcopacy to the Roman hierarchy. After following you, then, through a long and laborious course, I cheerfully conclude with yourself, “that you have given us no satisfactory account of the *rise* and *progress* of Prelacy.” No, Sir, new documents, or new laws of evidence, or new rules of reasoning, will be necessary, before this can be done; for its *origin* is not human, but divine; not the work of uninspired, but of inspired ministers.

[Some persons maintain that the uncovenanted mercy of God, by which is meant that mercy which is not conveyed through the seals of the covenant, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, affords no ground of hope for salvation. And hence they assert, that the advocates for the necessity of Episcopal ordination to the valid administration of the seals of the covenant, when they consign all who are not in communion with this ministry to uncovenanted mercy, strip them of every hope of salvation; and, of course, make the only alternative, "Episcopacy or perdition." That such an alternative is by no means involved in the Episcopal opinion above stated; and that the gracious Being "who gave his Son a ransom for all," has extended, and will extend future blessedness to the sincere and pious, who, through no wilful neglect or errors of their own, are without the pale of the covenant; we have more than once maintained from the pulpit and from the press. We are happy to be able to fortify our opinion by the very conclusive reasoning of the following treatise; in which, though without any reference to the Episcopal opinion to which we have here alluded, the writer considers the important question, "How far a state of visible covenant with God in this life is connected with the blessedness of a future state of existence?"]

For the Churchman's Magazine.

On the Case of the Heathen, as contemplated in the Scriptures, An Appendix to the Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.

IT was hinted, in the introduction to this work, that there attached to the general question of it the subordinate question, how far a state of visible covenant with God in this life is connected with the blessedness of a future state of existence: and a caution was given against supposing, that, in all circumstances, the one were no otherwise to be attained to, than through the medium of the other. But as there could not be much said, without going beyond the limits of the epistle, it is judged expedient to add something, in the way of appendix.

It is not rare, to find respectable and learned ministers of the

Gospel expressing the hope, that God extends his mercy to the virtuous Heathen: But some of them entertain this hope in such a manner, as proves, that, however agreeable the expectation to their own humane minds, they are not without apprehension of their having gone further, than they are warranted by the Oracles of God. The object of this appendix is to prove, that it is a conspicuous truth of Holy Scripture.

As the appendix is designed to supply a defect, because of a point rather presumed than proved in the body of the performance; so likewise there is a trust, that it cannot be deemed superfluous, in reference to the Calvinistic theory; which pronounces a severer sentence on the heathen world, than any here conceived to be found in the word of God, or to be inferred from it. Calvin affirms (book ii. ch. ii. sect. 22) "The end of the law of nature is, that man may be rendered inexcusable;" and again, "to take away all pretence of ignorance from man, when they are reprov'd by their own consciences." And just before, commenting on Rom. ii. 14. he had said—"Because this might have seem'd absurd, that the Gentiles should perish without a preceding judgment, he (the Apostle) immediately adds, that their conscience is to them for a law; and therefore suffices for their just damnation!"

Conformably to this, when preaching of predestination in the 5th sect. of the 21st ch. of his 3d book, he says—"God has not only testified it of individuals, but has given a specimen of it in the whole progeny of Abraham:" the subsequent reasoning, through several pages, showing that he considered first Ishmael and his posterity, and then Esau and his posterity, as under the sentence of reprobation. Turretine and Witsius, deliver themselves in language like that of Calvin: And the same is well known to be common in Calvinistic writers. There is not here unknown that a language somewhat different from that of Calvin has been held since his time by Calvinist churches; which confess, that there are elect persons, not called by the ministry of the word. But this distinction will be kept out of view; partly because the author knows not on what testimonies of Scripture it is grounded; but principally because his remarks will rest on principles, to which the distinction will be foreign. By these from whom he departs, there is held, what is here most heartily acknowledged, that, from the fall of man to the present day,

there has been a church or visible body, living in the profession of a divine revelation ; which, as to its great object, has been the same under different dispensations. From the truth stated there has been inferred—and this is the matter here denied—that beyond the limits of that pale—with the modern exception perhaps of some unknown elect—there are none who attain to the favour of God in this life and his presence in another : that this is evident in the general tenor of holy writ ; and that there are no testimonies in it to the contrary.

Let there not be supposed of what is to follow, that it is a result of a low sense of the advantages formerly possessed by the Jewish Church, and of the greater advantages since belonging to the Christian. Perhaps, however, there may be properly said of both, what was said by St. Paul of one of them only, that their pre-eminence consisted “ chiefly ” in this, that “ to them were committed the Oracles of God.” Many and inestimable are the benefits now enjoyed by Christian people, over those held by any other. They have more information of the process of the moral government of God, from the creation to the consummation of all things : They have more ample and more excellent instructions for the government of life : They have more persuasive motives to a suitable practice : In the event of falling into sin, they have stronger incitements to repentance ; especially in the communications made to them of the great sacrifice for sin and of acceptance through its merits : They have assurances which reason never could have supplied, of the aids of divine grace, to quicken and sustain them : And they have an immortality set before them, which, on the ground of rational deduction, might have been hoped for, but could not have been assured. All these particulars might be amplified to a great extent : But they are merely adverted to, in order to show, that while we thank God, above all his mercies, for the gift of Revelation ; and while we lament the awful condition of those, who, from indifference or from the love of sin, reject it ; we need not suppose of our merciful Lord, that in his dispensations to his other servants, he is “ the hard master who reaps where he has not sown and gathers where he has not strawed.” No : As the Scriptures frequently assure us, all men will be judged according to their works ; according to these, no doubt, as connected with the states of mind from which they issue ; and both being

taken in connection with the lights which have been bestowed.

Although, in the epistle itself, we find the Apostle incidentally speaking to the purpose, as was stated in the introduction ; yet it is hardly to be expected, that he should have discoursed of it professedly ; because there was nothing in the economy under which he lived, so circumscribing the divine favour, as to suggest a reasonable doubt concerning the future condition of the virtuous Heathen. To be within the covenant was a distinguishing privilege, in the estimation of a devout Jew : But there was no ground on which he could have pronounced of all who were strangers to it, that they were cut off from the paternal regard of the great Being, concerning whom St. Paul so pertinently demands—"Is he the God of the Jews only ? Is he not also of the Gentiles?"

In inquiring into the sense of the Old Testament concerning this matter ; we of course go back to the time of Abraham. The peculiar designation of his family may be considered as beginning with the call given to him in Ur of the Chaldees, and recorded in the 12th ch. of Genesis—"Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy Father's house, unto a land that I will show thee : " The covenant, however, was not established, until the transaction related in the 15th chapter. Now let there be observed the existing proofs, that the contrary of the position here maintained could not have been in the mind, either of Abraham or of the writer of the Pentateuch, as forming a part of the divine dispensation, at that time established.

Of the proofs from that period, there may be mentioned three ; and the first of them, shall be the not including of Lot and his family, within the covenant. When Lot intercedes thus for Sodom—"If there be fifty righteous within the city, wilt thou not spare the place for the fifty righteous that are therein ; " rising in his demand, until he obtains the promise—"if there be ten righteous within the city, I will spare it for the ten's sake ; " and when we find that Lot and his family, being not ten in number, although they could not save the city, were themselves saved by a permitted flight ; what are we to conclude, but that the fugitives are affirmed by Scripture history to be righteous. And as to Lot himself, he is expressly so called by St. Peter. 2d Ep. 2d ch. 8th ver.

Next, when we read of Abimelech King of Gerar, on the occasion of a judgment brought on his subjects, drawing nigh to God with the expostulation—"Lord wilt thou also destroy a righteous nation;" and when we find the same Abimelech the subject of a divine admonition and promise; it is not natural to conceive of himself and of his people, as cast off from the love of God.

Another instance is Melchisedeck, King of Salem; a righteous king, as is denoted by his name. This man was evidently without the covenant; and yet, he is called a Priest of the most high God and made a type of the Messiah; who is "a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedeck."

We may go on, beyond the time of Abraham, to other instances in sacred history. Job was an alien from the commonwealth of Israel; and yet he is mentioned by the prophet Ezekiel, as one of the three, the most perfect in ancient times; and in the history, he is described by the pen of inspiration, as "a perfect and an upright man, one that feared God and eschewed evil." He is generally understood to have been of the posterity of Esau; on all of whom the curse in the 9th chapter of the Epistle is supposed by some to have been laid in a spiritual sense. It has indeed been conjectured, that Job lived before the giving of the law: But as no such circumstance is mentioned, it must have been indifferent in the mind of inspiration, as to the purpose for which his name is introduced in this place. Even if we should hold with some, that the character is fictitious; still we must believe, that it is accommodated to the truth of the circumstances, under which his example was to be displayed.

Equally beyond the limits of the covenant, were Jonadab the son of Rechab and the patriarchal family governed by him; a branch of the family of the father-in-law of Moses; who maintained their independence in the country to the south of Judea, during the greater part of the Israelitish history; and were owned by Jehovah as a pious and virtuous people, in a message by his prophet.

But perhaps it will be remarked of all the persons mentioned, that they were worshippers of the one true God. Who can affirm, however, that the same may not be applicable, to some persons, among all the nations of the earth? Individuals might

be mentioned, of whom it is undisputed : And it would be unreasonable to doubt of there having been very many, not regardless of the great Being, who had “ not left himself without a witness” in his works.

It may be asked—What excuse is to be made for the abominable idolatries to imaginary deities of an inferior grade, commonly intermixed with the adoration, where it is to be found, of one great Supreme ? The answer is—No other excuse, than such as is commonly made under the Christian law, for men upright in general character ; but misled, in certain instances, by the errors of their respective times. To mention a single instance : It would be difficult to demonstrate, that the offering of homage to a supposed subordinate divinity, or the worshipping of the one only God under the symbol of an image, is in itself more faulty and more inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, than the taking of life for supposed errors in religion. This corruption of Christianity is not here laid to the door of any particular denomination of professing Christians ; but is chargeable on Roman Catholics and on Protestants ; and on all the denominations of the latter, who have tasted of the sweets of independent power.* If God hath said, in reference to idolatry—“ I will not give my glory to another ;” he has also given as a reason of his prohibiting of the injurious taking away of life—“ In the image of God made he man.” But in the present day, when religious rights are better understood than formerly ; we are fain to apologize for error in this matter, by the plea of the general prevalence of it : Which is nothing else, than an endeavour—and, it is trusted a successful one—to cover the fault referred to with that very mantle of charity, which St. Paul actually threw over it, when he said to the Athenians—“ The times of this ignorance God winked at.” And this may

* Persecution by temporal penalties, for errors in religion, is treated in this place not as an immorality, although it doubtless deserves the name, but as a most pernicious error. If it were more contemplated in this point of view, there would arise an inducement to moderation ; and there would be prevented much mutual condemnation for less destructive errors in opinion ; while, from circumstances, we are constrained to make a favourable allowance, for this greater one, in characters of former times. Certainly it cannot be incorrect, to consider persecution as the effect of heresy, according to the sense in which the word is usually understood. When men are guilty of theft, or of adultery, or of murder in any other way ; it does not follow that they judge erroneously, concerning the laws against which they are offenders. But persecution has always bottomed itself on a zeal to do God service ; and is therefore an offence, not only against Christian morals, but against Christian truth.

serve for argument, as well as for example : For although it is a frequent practice to evade the full force of the words, by referring them, to God's not sending till then of a revelation against prevalent idolatry ; yet were it not for the effect on the point before us, it could hardly be overlooked, that the natural construction makes them declaratory of his not rigorously punishing, where there was want of better information to prevent.

When we go on to the New Testament, the first instance that meets us, is of the eastern sages. It will not be alleged, that they were under the Old Testament economy ; and as to the New, it was not begun. Let there not be objected, that they were brought to Christ and exercised faith in him. The revelation of his birth had been previously made : And was it to persons labouring under the wrath of God, that so signal a favour had been extended ?

The parable of the good Samaritan is in point ; because what is attached to a fictitious person must be considered as what might have belonged to a real character of the day. Let there be recollected, then, that the Samaritan was one of those, against whom our Saviour had given his decision on the question concerning the proper place of worship ; saying—" Salvation is of the Jews." In respect to the covenant of promise, therefore, there was no more title to it, than among any people professedly pagan. And besides, their worship was much intermixed with idolatry ; having had its origin in the apostacy of Jeroboam ; when he set up the golden calves in Bethel and in Dan. Yet of a member of such a community our Lord records an action evidently represented to be pure in its motive and acceptable to God : For nothing less can be implied in the injunction which makes the moral of the parable—" Go and do thou likewise."

Perhaps as decisive a proof as any that can be adduced, is in the description of the final judgment, in the 25th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel ; in which all nations are represented, standing before the Judge. Without laying stress on the word "*εθνοι* ;" no words can be more comprehensive of the universality of mankind, to be separated under the names of sheep and goats. Not only are they inclusive of the virtuous Heathen ; but there is something especially descriptive of these, in the question—" Lord when saw we thee an hungered and fed thee ; or thirsty and gave thee drink : " Because Christians would not be igno-

rant, of what had been assured to them by their Master, relative to their needy brethren—"as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me."*

When it is said in Luke xii. 47, 48—"That servant which knew his Lord's will and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes;" it is implied, that men will be judged, according to the dispensations under which they have been respectively placed: There being nothing in the declaration, the principle of which does not reach to the full extent of this.

The case of Cornelius is very significative. Let there not be said, for the evasion of the inference to be drawn from it, that this man was converted to the Christian faith, at the expense of a miracle. While he was yet an Heathen, his "prayers and alms came up for a memorial before God;" being accepted—for this must be implied—through the merits of him than whom "there is none other name given among men whereby they can be saved." On the case of Cornelius is grounded the declaration of St. Peter concerning the virtuous Heathen generally—"In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him."†

Independently on these authorities conceived to be directly in favour of the position; it seems essentially involved in all those passages, which speak of the goodness of God to mankind generally; as where St. Paul calls him "the Saviour of all

* The interpretation given on the other side makes the meaning of the expression "all nations" to be the professors of the Christian religion in all nations. It is difficult to say, how far the same position may appear differently to different minds: But were it not known, to how great an extent the diversity may take place; it would be here presumed, that the stating of the above would suffice for the refutation of it.

† The way of withdrawing Cornelius from the operation of the principle here pleaded for, is by supposing that he was a proselyte of righteousness, or else believed in Christ; although not a word is said to either effect. The circumstances of his case are presumptive of the contrary. That he could not have been what was called among the Jews a proselyte of righteousness, is evident: For in that case, there would not have been brought the charge against St. Peter—"Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them." His station in the Roman army, his distance from the original seat of Christian doctrine, his having no idea of the information which his visitant was to bring, his taking the Apostle for more than man, and the Apostle's statement of Christian truths, presumptive indeed that tidings of them had reached Cornelius, but at the same time, that evidence was wanting to him; all these are little suited to the idea, that this heaven favoured man had been of the number of believers, before the miraculous event recorded.

men ;” and where Christ says of his *Almighty Father*—“ He causeth his sun to rise on the evil and on the good ; and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust. Be it, that such passages speak of the providential care of God in the present life : Still if that care be extended to men, only to aggravate a condemnation, necessarily resulting from the circumstances in which the same Providence had placed them ; such declarations, to say the least, are not to the purpose for which they seem to have been made, of magnifying the goodness of the divine Being.

There is another remarkable passage in *St. Matthew* viii. 11. compared with *St. Luke* xiii. 23. The words are nearly the same in both Gospels ; but in *St. Matthew*, they are—“ Many shall come from the East and West ; and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of Heaven.” It has been made a question, whether this relates to the influx of the Heathen into the Church ; or to the admission of persons of that description, being virtuous, into Heaven. It cannot be denied, that some judicious commentators give it the former turn ; but as the latter is here preferred, the reasons should be given.

What has principally led to the supposition, that the passage relates to professors of Christianity, is, that in *St. Matthew*, the recited words come in just after the healing of the servant of a Roman Centurion ; with a commendation of his faith, as superior to any found in Israel : And there seems something very pertinent in the sentiment, that many, of the same description with this Centurion, would, like him, exercise faith in the Messiah. In *St. Luke*, however, the declaration is in almost the same words ; but without the record of any such circumstance, appearing to give a limitation to the meaning.

In both passages, they are said to come “ from the East and from the West ;” with the addition in the latter passage of the words “ and from the North and from the South.” But the propagation of the Gospel among the Heathen was not by their coming to the original seat of it : It was by its being carried to them.

The converts to the Christian faith could not sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, understood in the sense of the Church on earth ; and therefore, the expression must have been applied to the better kingdom in Heaven.

And this is especially clear in St. Luke ; where, the subject being the final judgment, it is pleaded by some before the Judge—" we have eaten and drunk in thy presence and thou hast taught in our streets." These however " see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God and themselves thrust out : " And then come in the words here remarked on ; which of course designate persons opposed to the proceeding, in regard to opportunity of receiving instruction and making a profession.

Mr. Taylor gives the following reason—and it seems of great weight—against the interpretation exploded. He says, that according to it, the assertion of our Saviour is not in point. It makes an opposition between the present children of the kingdom, that is, the Jews ; and the future children, that is, Christians : Whereas, the opposition ought to be between the former and such persons as the Centurion, that is, Heathens.

The manner in which the three passages last quoted are treated by Dr. Doddridge is worthy of notice. In his interpretation of that of St. Matthew viii. 11. and that of St. Luke xiii. 29. he has not a word expressive of the sentiment of other writers on his system, limiting the description of the righteous to a proportion of the professors of all nations ; but gives an interpretation, which implies, but does not positively express the opinion, here sustained. It is more evidently implied, although still not expressed in his interpretation and improvement of Matthew xviii. 11. But when he comes to the passage in the 10th chapter of the Acts, the opinion is evident in the interpretation ; and still more so in a note ; in which he comments as follows on the words—" he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him."—" This, for any thing I can see, might be supposed the case of many, who were far from being in any degree Jewish proselytes, and had never heard of the Jews and their religion, as it was certainly the case of many, before the peculiarities of Judaism existed, and even before the institution of the Abrahamic covenant. I think this text proves, that God would sooner send an angel to direct pious and upright persons to the knowledge of the Gospel, than suffer them to perish by ignorance of it."

The above is exactly to the present purpose. But in the remainder of the note, principally intended to distinguish the case

of Cornelius, from that of persons who reject Christian light bestowed, Dr. Doddridge seems to have entertained the further design of avoiding a shock to prejudice, by what had gone before. For, speaking of the sense of the passage as opened by him, he continues thus:—"But far from intimating, that some such persons may be found among those that reject Christianity, when offered to them in its full evidence, it determines nothing concerning the existence of such in every nation, (meaning such as Cornelius) though it tells us, how God regards them, supposing them to exist."

It is here thought a reasonable conclusion from the premises, that no part of the human race are placed, by the condition of their birth, beyond the reach of the mercy of God, through Christ. In regard to the Heathen; we may properly speak of them, as being left to the uncovenanted mercies of God. For we know not the grounds on which they shall be judged: While, in regard to ourselves, we have great reason to bear in mind our Lord's decision concerning the talents—"Unto whom much is given, of them there will be much required."

IMPROPRIETIES OF BEHAVIOUR IN CHURCH CENSURED.

An extract from a Sermon by the Rev. Theophilus St. John.

I Now proceed to take notice of the errors observable in our congregations. I mention first, the manner in which some people go into Church; they appear quite careless and indifferent; when they go to their seats, they sit down with as much unconcern, as if the business they went about were of no consequence. Let me recommend it, earnestly recommend it, to every person, rich and poor, young and old, as soon as you get to your respective places, to "fall meekly upon your knees," and to beseech Almighty God to accept your prayers and devotion, to grant a blessing to what the minister is about to deliver, and to bring it home to your consciences. Let me beg of you all, to make use of such a prayer every time you go into the Church, and let me prevail with you, to teach your children one likewise.

Such a behaviour would be devout and reverent ; we should then *appear* like what *we are*, a congregation of fallen creatures, supplicating Salvation of our Almighty Creator. But there is one thing I would recommend *before* you go into the Church ; consider into whose house, and for what purpose, you are going. And when you enter the Church-yard, look with serious reflections on the graves, the repositories of the silent dead ; consider that you may never be permitted to walk among them again, and that the very next grave that is opened may be for yourself. Such reflections will suggest a reverent behaviour in the House of God.

(2) Many people go late into the Church, and often, not without making a prodigious noise, so that not only the whole congregation is disturbed ; but some, thoughtlessly and inconsiderately, whether they are engaged in prayer, or in attending to the word of God, instantly withdraw from their duty, and thus add to the noise and confusion already made. Now, no person who considers he is supplicating a blessing from Almighty God, perhaps preservation “from sudden death, or from eternal damnation,” would presume either to rise from his knees, or to cease offering his petition, because some person at that time is going to his seat. One cannot but wish, if for no other reason, that every one would be early in his attendance on the service of the Church.

I cannot here omit mentioning, that if the least noise be made, either by the falling of a book, or any other little accident, how very anxious many people seem till they know what is the matter. Let your attention be fixed upon God, and the salvation of your souls, and you will not withdraw it from the solemn business in which you are engaged.

(3) There is an indecency that it is much to be feared prevails in almost every congregation. I mean the shameful, the irreverent, custom of praying to God, in the indolent posture of sitting on our seats. Were a person taken in a country of savages, whose custom was to murder every one they apprehended, would he, when they made signs to him that he was going to die, sit indolently down, and carelessly ask them to spare his life ? Would he not fall upon his knees, and earnestly implore their mercy ? How

few show the same solicitude for their eternal salvation—let this congregation bear witness!

Should any man, to excuse his want of devotion, fancy, that, although he repeats his prayers in a sitting posture, yet he prays in his heart, and hears what the minister prays, and observes, and goes along with him, let him weigh well in his mind the direction of the Apostle, “glorify God in your *body*, as well as in your spirit, for both are God’s.”

Though God, principally, requires the heart, yet having made our bodies, an homage is due unto God from them. And be assured, where the heart is right towards God,” the reverence of the body will naturally follow, as far as it is in the power of the heart to command it.

Good men, in all ages, have not contented themselves to worship God with good thoughts, or inward motions only, but with the external acts of religion—such as either the institution and practice of the Church, or the custom of the country had made external signs of honour; as uncovering the head, bowing the body, kneeling on our knees.

Nor has any age, I believe, of the Christian Church produced men, who have betrayed such slight thoughts of God, and his Son Jesus Christ as the present, in the careless and negligent way of worship to which many seem to have given themselves up.

I have to add, that, as many people may object they cannot kneel upon the bare ground, it is devoutly to be wished that every one who is able, would provide himself, as he may do it at a trifling expense, with a bass, or hassock, for the purpose—and that every person who is not able to procure one might be supplied by the superintendents of the parish. Your Church would then have much more the appearance of an house of God, than it has at present.

It is, however, to be observed, that some, from age, or bodily infirmity, or from a variety of causes, cannot bear to kneel during the time of service with comfort, and, therefore, cannot kneel with devotion. It is not expected, nor would it be proper, that such people should attempt to do it; but let me suggest even to these, that the utmost reverence is due from them to God, and that, if they do not neglect to pay it, though they

are obliged to sit on their seats, he will mercifully accept their services.

(4) I am next to take notice of the extreme impropriety of leaning against the pews, or seats, during the time of the reading of the Psalms, and of the Prayers by those who stand up, as though those persons were unable to support themselves. It betrays a shameful indifference for the worship and service of God. Let all men, whose behaviour is so irreverent, consider, that assuredly "the Lord is in this place," beholding, and observing them.

(5) Let me remark too, that a very disagreeable custom prevails of repeating aloud after the minister, to the great disturbance of many who sit near them, those parts of the service in which the congregation should follow him only with the eye. Sometimes they read too fast, and prevent others from understanding what he says. The Rubric directs where the people should repeat; and where it gives no directions, it intends that the congregation should be silent, and listen to the minister.

(6) I would, briefly, mention another circumstance, which, though it may escape general observation, ought, I think, to be suggested and impressed: those who have Bibles in the Church, generally look for the text; and usually, the whole congregation, when it is taken out of the Psalms; and some are, often, so long in finding it, that a part of the sermon is finished before they have paid the smallest attention to it. Now, the first part of the sermon is often an explanation of the text; and if people do not know the meaning of the text, they cannot profit much, I apprehend, by the discourse upon it.

(7) Let me mention, further, what has always given great offence to serious minds, the levity, and foolish talking, to which many addict themselves in the house of God. One would imagine that such people go with no other view than to make remarks on the dress, on the finery, and folly, of their neighbours. Is whispering, talking, laughing, seemly, do you think, in God's presence? Let me beseech you to cease from so foolish and so sinful a practice.

(8) Let me, lastly, take notice of another indecency, committed chiefly by the younger part of the congregation; I mean the irreverent custom of rushing out of the Church, almost before the service is concluded. Let me prevail with you all,

and you who are fathers and masters more especially, to enjoin your children and servants, before they depart from God's house, to go reverently on their knees, and beseech God to forgive the wanderings of their hearts, and the coldness of their devotions ; that, " what they have heard with their outward ears, may produce in them the fruits of good living." Teach them then to depart like sinful creatures, who have been worshipping an Almighty God.

I will beg your patience a moment longer, whilst I attempt to impress upon your minds what has been said.

Let me then request of you all, my brethren, to think seriously, before you enter the Church, into whose awful presence you are going. And when you have entered it, let me beseech you to fall meekly on your knees, to supplicate God's acceptance of your prayers, and to grant that the word to be preached, may become " a savor of life unto life," to all that hear it. Let there be, in future, no noise made by your entering it ; to prevent which, be early in your attendance. And whether you are reading, or hearing, the word, or offering up your prayers and thanksgivings, do not let any little disturbance, as the opening of a door, or the falling of a book, withdraw your attention from your duty. Let this Church be, in future, distinguished by the reverence and devotion of all who frequent it ; and let me entreat you to pay so much honour to Almighty God, as to pray to him, not in your present custom of sitting on your seats, or even the more decent one of standing, but " meekly kneeling on your knees." Let all impertinent gazing at other people's dress ; let all talking, whispering, and laughing, be for ever banished from this holy place. And instead of hastily departing before the blessing is pronounced, let us return thanks to God for the opportunity of attending his house and service, and beg his grace to accompany what has been delivered.

May God Almighty grant, that neither our negligence in frequenting this sanctuary of truth, nor our contentions in rending and troubling it, nor our irreligion in polluting it, may ever hinder the benefit we hope to reap in it, nor prevent his hearing all our prayers, which we put up in humility and reverence ! May the eyes of that gracious and holy God we come here to worship, be opened, day and night, in this house of prayer, and his ears attentive to our petitions, and his hands

open and ready to relieve our wants, and to bless us every Lord's day, and in all our weekly concerns to our lives end, through Jesus Christ our Lord!

[We are persuaded our readers will be gratified by the following interesting communication from the pen of one to whom our Church has been long indebted for the frequent exertion of his zeal and talents in her defence; and we therefore make no apology for devoting a considerable number of our pages to it. Every friend to Evangelical truth, and to the Apostolic order and institutions of the Church will rejoice to see these important subjects so correctly discussed, and so eloquently defended.]

For the Churchman's Magazine.

Brief remarks on Christian Doctrine, on the Worship, the Sacraments, and the Constitution of the Church, and on some important parts of ministerial duty: In a letter from A. F. to a Candidate for Holy Orders in the State of —.

DEAR SIR,

AS you have been for some time preparing yourself for Holy Orders, and will soon be invested with a sacred, and important character, allow me to suggest, in the spirit of friendship, a few ideas, which will be of service to you in your future life, and which, if you suffer them to operate with all their force on your mind, will render you a zealous and useful labourer in the vineyard of Christ.

The motive from which you enter into the sacred ministry, is, I am satisfied, pure and correct. Your mind has been impressed from an early period, with a strong sense of the necessity of a virtuous and pious life; and for a long time you have had a full conviction, that it is incumbent on every man to employ his time and talents in such a way, as will best promote his own salvation, and the salvation of others. From the turn of your mind, the nature of your talents, and the ardent wish of your heart to contribute your mite to the sum of human happiness, you have justly inferred, that it is the will of your Creator, that you should

devote yourself to the service of the sanctuary. For it is a principle, with the correctness of which I am well satisfied, that the Almighty distinctly marks men for the more important stations of life, by the species of talent with which he has endowed them, and by the corresponding ardor of mind which he has given them. There is indeed danger of error in this, as in every other particular. Men may misconceive the kind of talents which they possess ; but this I believe is not very frequently the case. Experience, it appears to me, justifies the assertion, that a corresponding inclination, like a kind of instinct, accompanies the powers of the human mind, and that men, generally speaking, fall into that course of action, for which they are best fitted by nature. There may be some gross deviations from this pole-star of human life ; but then the mind has been perverted by wrong education ; its native fire has been diminished, or extinguished by the contagion of vicious example ; or by accidents not foreseen, or uncontrollable, it has been reduced to straits in which its powers could not be displayed, and its energies exerted. These exceptions, like exceptions of every other kind, do but confirm the truth of the general observation.

Qualified then, as I believe you to be, by talents, by disposition, by pious intention, and by the fruit of your industry, literary acquirements, you will enter into the ministry from a motive worthy of your profession. This motive being primary and commanding, you need not be at all uneasy at your wishing to be placed, where circumstances may correspond with the respectability of your profession. The probability of doing good being pretty equal in most situations, you have an undoubted right to prefer comfortable circumstances to poverty, moderate exertion to excessive labour, and minds congenial with your own, for your friends and companions. This would be perfectly justifiable were you to continue all your life in a single state ; but should you become a husband and a father, the obligation to provide for your own household, will be imperious and indispensable. We have no right to reduce to a life of shifts those whom God has given us, when we have the means of putting them into a situation, in which they may entertain better hopes, and enjoy happier days. It is a Gospel maxim, "he that provideth not for his own house is worse than an infidel ;" and I am sure, that it has never yet been shown, that the ministers of

the altar are the only order of men, to whom this most rational declaration is not applicable.

Your purpose being fixed with respect to your future sphere of life, and being perfectly pure and correct as to your motives, you will proceed to furnish your mind with all those principles and doctrines, which are clearly contained in the holy scriptures. Here a wide field opens to your contemplation. You have to survey the vast scheme of redemption from the beginning to the end, so far as it is revealed to us. Contemplate it, my friend, with astonishment, with love, with adoration. A world fallen! A world redeemed! *Sin* destroying all the hopes of man! *Grace* restoring them! And how is this mighty deliverance effected? Shall we consult the dictates of reason? They afford us no light. Shall we turn over the pages of philosophy? Darkness, midnight darkness rests upon them. Nothing illumines our inquiry—nothing directs our feet but the book of God. That book informs us, that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.” This was the origin of evil—this, the cause of our degradation. But in this state we were not left. The same holy record assures us that, “the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent.” Here is the dawn of our deliverance—a dawn which continually brightened, till the sun of righteousness arose and diffused full light over a benighted world. The grave is now no longer the boundary of our fleeting moments; nor do “shadows, clouds, and darkness” rest upon our future existence. “We shall know even as we are known.”

Let me then intreat you to make the fall of man, and his consequent degradation and depravity, the foundation of all your preaching. On this ground, the redemption of the human race by the blood of a Saviour, is a complete scheme of mercy and goodness—on any other, the book of God from beginning to end is perfectly inconsistent, and wholly unintelligible. On this ground, we can account for the universal practice of shedding blood for the remission of sins, and for the most important types and figures of the old dispensation. On this ground, “great is the mystery of godliness;” on any other, the gospel is little better than a system of ethics, with better hopes indeed than we derive from the pages of Cicero and Plato.

This great doctrine of the atonement by the blood of a Sa-

viour being firmly rooted in your mind, you will be in no danger of either the Socinian or the Arian heresy. A mere man, or any created being making atonement for the sins of the whole world, is preposterous. The utmost that he could do would amount to no more than his own personal obedience, which, strictly speaking, could not merit eternal life even for himself; how much less then for the whole human race? There can be no proportion between the most sinless obedience, and an eternity of happiness; which, if conferred at all, must be conferred by God's goodness, and by virtue of his most gracious promise. Accordingly we find, that Arians and Socinians reject the atonement by the blood of Christ, and rest their hope of happiness on their own wretchedly defective obedience. Gracious heaven! that there should be men who call themselves Christians, denying that they "were bought with a price," and that it is not necessary to believe that "without shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin." Yet, lamentable as it is, such is the case; and there is no remedy for them that I know of, but to cultivate a humble teachable disposition, and a deep sense of their own depravity and guilt.

If then a mere man, or the most exalted created intelligence, could not merit for a sinful world eternal life, the Saviour who effected it must be a divine being. This gives infinite value to what, without it, would have little or none. Accordingly, the scriptures assure us, that Christ is "God over all, blessed for ever"—that he is the "mighty God, the Father of eternity—Jehovah our righteousness"—the "Creator of the world"—the "Alpha and Omega"—the beginning and the end"—which are the very titles ascribed to the Almighty Father. The scriptures ascribe to Christ all the attributes of Divinity—omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence. Can these things be said of Christ, if he is no more than a creature? It is impossible: No creature can possess those attributes. They are the essential properties of Divinity; and cannot be communicated to any created intelligence. What then shall we say of the scriptures which use this language? Do they not, on the Arian or Socinian hypothesis, necessarily lead us into idolatry? Have they not actually led into it the great body of Christians in all ages and countries? Did not Christ claim divine honours? Did he not receive divine worship? Are not all the angels of God

commanded to worship him? Do not then the scriptures speak a language which must necessarily lead men into idolatry? Does not Christ himself speak such a language? Misguided, deluded Christians! ye are liable to all the vengeance of the Almighty for your idolatry in worshipping a creature instead of, or in conjunction with the Creator; and yet ye are led into this most provoking of all crimes by the Almighty himself! No, my friend, this is impossible—let God be true, though every man prove a liar. Our Redeemer is one in essence with the Father and the Holy Ghost—three persons, but one infinite, eternal Jehovah.

This doctrine appears in almost every part of our incomparable liturgy, and that man who uses it, and yet does not believe in the divinity of the Son of God, is not worthy of his sacred office, but ought to be degraded from the ministry, and ejected altogether from the communion of the Church. There can be no medium in this case; we must either be *for* Christ, or *against* him—believe him either to be God, or a creature. All the refinements and subtleties of metaphysics do but end in this alternative. Choose you then whom you will serve—Christ, the creature of the Arians and Socinians, or Christ, the God of the Christians.

So important, so essential is this doctrine of the divinity of Christ, that I cannot conceive how any person who disbelieves it, can be entitled to the name of a Christian. If such were ever baptized, it was done “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost”—that is, on the Socinian hypothesis, in the name of the Father and of two creatures; or on the Arian hypothesis, in the name of the Father, a creature, and the Father again under the title of the Holy Ghost. What a monstrous outrage is this on common sense! What daring impiety to rank creatures with the Almighty! And this too by the express command of the Redeemer, who, as they acknowledge, was sent to lead us into all truth! Surely, men of this character can have little or no claim to the title of Christians—to the title of disciples of that Saviour, who shed his blood to redeem us from all iniquity.

To these essential doctrines of the Christian system, the depravity of human nature, the atonement by the precious bloodshedding of Christ, and the trinity of persons in the divine na-

ture, you will add the mysterious influence of the Holy Ghost on the hearts of true believers. This doctrine is repeatedly inculcated in the sacred writings. Under both the old and new dispensation, the pious ever prayed for the assistance of God's holy spirit; and even heathen philosophy was not a stranger to it. By this holy influence we are renewed, sanctified, and conformed to the divine image, in the use of those means of grace instituted by the great Head of the Church. These means are baptism, the holy eucharist, prayer, and the word of God. These are the *ordinary* means of improvement in virtue and piety; and he who expects to attain the great end of his calling, the salvation of his soul, without these means, is either an enthusiast, or a despiser of divine institutions. God works in both the natural and moral world by secondary causes. In the natural, we acknowledge we feel that our animal life depends upon them. In the moral, we are told by the word of infallible truth, that it is equally so with respect to our spiritual life; and every pious Christian acknowledges it with humble gratitude. By baptism, we are made members of the *body* of Christ, and are therefore introduced into a different state from that in which we are by nature. By nature, we have no covenant right to the mercies of redemption; by baptism, we receive a title to those mercies. So different are these conditions, that they are represented in the strong, figurative language of holy writ, as a *new birth*. "Except," says the Saviour, "ye be born of water and the Holy Ghost, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." "We are saved," says the Apostle Paul, "by the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost." Baptism, according to this inspired Apostle, is one of the fundamentals of Christianity, and our Redeemer would never have spoken of it in such terms, and made it a sacrament of his Church, had he intended it as nothing more than a *sign of profession*, as some idly talk. But while you thus preserve the importance of this divine, covenanting, regenerating rite, carefully teach your hearers, that they must not rest in it, without "the renewal of the Holy Ghost," and "the answer of a good conscience!" Teach them, that it is but the beginning of a new and divine life—but the threshold of the kingdom of God. That it lays them under the most sacred obligations, but that these must be fulfilled. That it entitles them to all the promises of the Gospel, but that these

will never be realized unless they ardently and perseveringly cultivate piety of heart and godliness of life.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is another important rite of the Christian Church, instituted by Christ himself as a means of grace, and a pledge of his love. It seals and conveys to the worthy partaker, every blessing which his sinful nature stands in need of. Like the sacrifices under the old dispensation, which were typical of the great sacrifice of the cross, it strengthens our faith, confirms our hope, and leads us *from* ourselves to an entire dependence on the blood of atonement. It is the great *commemorative* sacrifice of the Christian Church; deriving all its efficacy, all its benefits from the great object to which it points—a Saviour's body broken and blood shed. Hence faith *in*, and suitable affections towards that Saviour, are essential requisites.

It is lamentable to see so many, who call themselves Christians, turn their backs on this most solemn and holy rite; some from a disregard to sacred things—others, not indeed from disrespect, but from a mistaken notion of the qualifications that are necessary to a worthy participation. These latter think, that they must be fit for the kingdom of glory before they are fit to approach the Lord's table; and yet, were they unbaptized, they would not hesitate to be washed in the *laver of regeneration*. But what good would this do them, were they not believers in a crucified Saviour; were they not penitent, and seriously determined to live no longer according to the flesh, but according to the spirit? *Without* these qualifications, they are no more fit for baptism than for the Lord's supper; and *with* them, they are equally fit for both.

On this subject you will need great caution; neither, on the one hand, encouraging those whose boldness and presumption exceed their seriousness and piety; nor, on the other, discouraging those who are too apt to despond, and are waiting for the happy moment of greater attainments. Here our Church will give you the most correct views. Her communion service is incomparable, both as to principle and devotional sentiment. Administered as the holy elements are at *her* altar, imagination cannot conceive a more noble, a more devotional scene in this state of sin and frailty. It is a scene, on which Angels may

look down with pleasure, and for whose devotional influence, thousands will bless God through eternity.

There is another rite of the Christian Church, which, when you shall be invested with the priesthood, will necessarily present itself to you as one of the subjects of your discourses. I mean what is commonly called *confirmation*. Although this is not ranked by our Church with the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, yet, she insists upon it as an Apostolical institution. And such it was ever esteemed by the whole Church of Christ, till those fatal divisions, which still subsist, took place at the Reformation. St. Paul places "the laying on of hands" among the fundamentals of the Christian system. These fundamentals relate to all Christians; but "the laying on of hands" in ordination, relates only to the ministers of religion. It cannot therefore mean *that*. Nor can it mean the ceremony used at the restoration of penitents, of heretics, of schismatics, and of the lapsed; for that also was partial; and not only so, but it was besides too much of the nature of a *circumstance* to be ranked so high. It remains therefore, that it can have no meaning but that which the Church has given it in all ages. And, indeed, if it had no other foundation but expediency, it would be highly proper. For what can be more proper, than that those who are baptized in their infancy, and who therefore could not understand the nature and obligations of that sacrament, should, when they come to years of discretion, take those obligations upon themselves, in a serious and solemn manner, before they are admitted to the holy communion? So rational is this, that even the Dissenters, (who seem to have created as many points of difference as they well could) have something like it in the custom of obliging persons to own their covenant, (as they term it) before they are admitted to the communion. But our Church, which always pays due respect to long established, and general usage, has preserved the *imposition of hands*, accompanied with an excellent form of prayer for the occasion. And those who have a due sense of the value of Apostolical usages, and are seriously disposed to "fulfil all righteousness," will not neglect to discharge the duty which they owe to the Church and to themselves, by partaking of the benefits that result from this most venerable and religious rite.

Here again, my friend, you will have need of much caution.

The Church must be your guide on this point also. She precludes from *confirmation* those that have not been previously instructed in the principles of the Christian system, and are not capable, either from a want of age, or from ignorance, to give a reasonable account of their faith. This lays ministers under an obligation, besides the positive injunction of the Church, diligently to catechise the children, and fully to assure themselves, that the youth to be presented to the Bishop, do clearly understand the nature and obligations of the baptismal covenant, and that they have (so far as man can judge) a sincere desire, by the grace of God, "faithfully to observe such things as they, by their own confession," shall assent unto.

In this important business of catechising children, I very much fear there is great neglect. Some Clergymen neglect it from mere indolence; and others, I have a strong suspicion, from a conceit that it is a business below their talents, which they can employ more to their own mind, and, as they flatter themselves, to better purposes. But what a contemptible character must he be, who will not discharge a humble duty, because he cannot have a wide and conspicuous field for a display of talents? Such a man can have no regard for "the praise which cometh from God;" his sole object is, to receive praise from men; and *that* he may possibly receive; but, it is much to be feared, that, acting from such a motive, it will be his *only* reward.

The last things which I mentioned as being divine appointments, and for improving us in virtue and piety, are, prayer and the word of God preached unto us. There can be no public worship without prayer. It is essential to the very idea of the worship of guilty creatures. Preaching indeed does not come within that idea. There may be preaching without worship, and worship without preaching. But it is too common to suppose, that preaching is a part of public worship, when it is only an appendage. Let this distinction be ever inculcated on your hearers, when the occasion admits of it. They will then come together, principally to worship their Creator; which, if they do with suitable affections, they will always be the better for it. Whereas, if the object they have in view is solely, or chiefly, to hear a sermon, they will most commonly be, neither wiser nor better when they leave the Church than when they entered it.

It is surprising what rude and improper ideas people in general have on this subject. To hear preaching is the grand point with numbers ; to worship God, is but little thought of. To the sermon, the ears of all are attentive, if the preacher be eloquent ; to the prayer, the hearts of few beat responsive. "God be merciful to me a sinner !" is a painful acknowledgment, from which the pride of human nature easily revolts ; to hear a well composed discourse, is grateful to our taste, and flattering to our vanity. In the *first* case, we stand as criminals, are disgusted with ourselves, and there is no room for self approbation ; in the *last*, we sit as judges, our good opinion is solicited, and our critical skill exercised. Hence that fondness for sermons, and that disregard to prayer.

This, my friend, is a great evil. It is attended with effects which are not generally perceived. It, in a great measure, weakens devotional feelings, produces restlessness during the service, and renders men less susceptible of religious improvement. Were they to pray more, they would hear to more advantage. They would be more humble and teachable ; more disposed to have their hearts amended, than their ears gratified. In meekness, they would then receive the "ingrafted word of God ;" the seed sown would be nourished by prayer and meditation ; and what now too generally is mere amusement, would then prove wisdom to the understanding, and life to the soul.

It is really pitiable to see so many well meaning people deceiving themselves in this particular. They seem to estimate the degree of their religious improvement, by the number of sermons which they hear in the course of the day. I have been told of some in this city, who make a point of hearing four sermons on the Lord's day—running about continually among the different denominations, and never settled in, or attached to any. What must the principles of such men be ? Or rather, how is it possible that they should have any principles ? It is not possible. Their intellect must be confused, their notions inconsistent, and their minds continually wavering. In this state, there can be no such thing as edification ; for chaos itself was not more confounded, than are the heads of such men.

Our Church, my friend, has made ample provision, in every respect, for the growth of her children in spiritual knowledge

and a holy life. We are furnished with a form of prayer, which stands unrivalled by the forms of other Churches. This, the advocates of *extempore* prayer admit to be the fact. I have read all the ancient liturgies that are extant, and several of the modern; but I declare, that I do not think any one of them is equal to ours. Take the collection of prayers that have been published by several of our ablest divines; take the little manual of *St. Augustin's confessions*, by Dr. Stanhope, and compare them with our offices, and the inferiority of the former strikes you immediately. There is in our liturgy such a charming simplicity, such purity of language, such a strain of chastened piety, and such soundness of principle, that it appears to me almost impossible there should be any who make pretensions to judgment, taste, and piety of sentiment, that can prefer to it the ill assorted and ill expressed matter, which you commonly hear from the lips of those who pray without premeditation. I have, in the course of my life, frequently heard the effusions of *extempore* prayer makers; but I am thankful to Almighty God, that he has not reduced me to the necessity of making them my ordinary fare. I return to the liturgy of our Church with an increased taste, and the temporary disgust I have suffered, does but heighten the subsequent gratification.

It affords me much pleasure, to see such a great and general attachment among our people to the book of *Common Prayer*. Such would be the case without the exception of a single congregation, were it not that a few hot headed enthusiasts, or vain, popularity seeking men, have got among us, who, to make way for the display of their own talent, or knack, (call it which you please) at *extempore* prayer, mangle the service in a most shameful manner. What business have such men in our Church, I want to know? It is evident they do not like the liturgy from the manner in which they use it, or rather abuse it. While they are eating the bread of the Church, and wearing her respectable garb, they are (whether it be directly their object or not) confounding her with other denominations, and thereby gradually undermining her. If they say, they do it to show their liberal way of thinking, and to bring over Presbyterians, and Methodists, and Baptists to the Church, they do but prove their own ignorance of human nature. To make Churchmen, the Church must not be *let down* to others, but they must be *brought up* to

her. Her principles, her Apostolic ministry, her excellent liturgy, must be maintained on all occasions ; and wherever it is done, the Church never fails to increase. Witness the state of Connecticut, in which thousands have been brought into the Church on true Church principles. Wherever the Clergy are sound Churchmen, and diligent and exemplary, the Church never fails to make a rapid progress. But sad is the contrast where there is no union among the Clergy, no zeal, no regard for the Church ; where her liturgy is deformed and cut up according to the whim of the operator ; where her canons and rubrics are continually and wantonly violated, and her discipline not existing even in shadow ; where candidates for orders are acting as ministers, and where ministers are acting as laymen. Need I appeal to facts for the truth of all this ? Does the Church flourish with you ? " No." And why not ? No reason whatever can be given for it, but the difference in the Clergy. Let your Clergy become zealous, orthodox, and regular, and I will answer for it, that in a few years the scene will be totally reversed. If men will not open their eyes to see, or will not learn from their own experience, it is in vain to think they will ever learn.

There is not perhaps any situation on this continent, in which a man of piety, zeal, talents, and eloquence could be placed to more advantage than in one of your populous towns. Were he to preach Christ Jesus the Lord, his divinity, the atonement by his blood, the wretched, depraved state of human nature, the necessity of repentance, and of the renewal of the mind by the Holy Ghost ; and were he further strictly to adhere to the liturgy and canons of the Church, I am confident that man, from the most trifling, would, in a few years, have a numerous congregation. There is in the human mind, notwithstanding its depravity, a feeling of uneasiness for its helpless condition. All men know themselves to be sinners, although the cares and pleasures of the world may divert them from due attention to the means of averting the penalty. In this state, will the empiricism of Socinianism, or Arianism heal the malady ? Will the dry morality of *Epictetus* prove balm to the wound ? Will conscious guilt be disposed to confide in a mere creature, as a mediator for reconciliation with heaven ? Be assured it will not. The preacher who points to the bloody atonement of the cross—

who sends his hearers to the God-man Christ Jesus, will be the preacher to whom the "weary and heavy laden will resort; while the husks of the Arian and Socinian will be spurned with contempt.

But I have wandered a little from the point in hand—from the *deformers* of our liturgy, and the *violators* of our canons. I would ask those men, What is become of their conscience? What is become of their honesty? They either were, or were not sincere, when they solemnly engaged, at the holy altar, before God and men, to be obedient to the authority of the Church, and to conform in every thing to her worship and discipline. If they were not sincere, they are most detestable hypocrites; if they were, then what induces them to violate engagements which, at the time, they meant to fulfil? Enthusiasm, I know, will furnish pretexts to which sober reason will never resort. Vanity, or the love of popularity, will also, I am well aware, be sometimes too hard a match for honesty and good faith. But are these the traits that should be found in the ministers of Christ? Is this having their conversation "in simplicity and godly sincerity?" Does this indicate humility and the love of order and decorum? Shame on those men who thus violate their solemn vows at the altar! And shame on those congregations which endure it!

There are but two more points which I shall mention as proper subjects for you to discuss, as occasions may render it expedient—those are, the nature and the constitution of the Christian Church. On these heads I shall be very short.

It is a lamentable circumstance that this subject is kept so much out of sight. For Dissenters from Episcopacy to say but little about it, may be prudent; but that Churchmen should be silent, cannot be easily justified. *Our* ground is firm; *theirs* is not. We have all antiquity on our side; consequently, they have all antiquity against them. Why then should not our Clergy give their people ample instruction on this point? Many of them I know do; but many, I fear, do not. Can it be possible that *these* suppose a Church of man's forming, as good as that which Christ formed? For there is no medium in this case, either Christ or man was the founder. If the latter, then the Church is not worth a straw. Its authority is human, its sacraments are human, its ministry is human. What part then is

divine? "His word." But this is no constituent part of the Church. It is that which sheds light within her; which nourishes and edifies her, and preserves her from corruption and total extinction. "The seven candlesticks," says the Angel, "are the seven Churches;" but who can be so weak as to confound the lights in those candlesticks with the candlesticks themselves? The Church then, in her authority, in her ministry and sacraments, must be divine.

This is further evident from its very nature. Christ himself calls it his *family*, his *household*, his *kingdom*. These prove it to be a society, and a society of divine origin, and divine continuance. If a society, it must have government and laws; for no society can possibly exist without them. This proves that Christ did not leave his Church without officers and laws; for if he had so left it, the Church would have instantly ceased to exist as a *society*, although it might have existed as a *sect*; that is, Christians might have held the same opinions, but they could have had no sacraments, nor ministry, nor divine government. Hence it is, that those who reject the sacraments and ministry can have no pretensions to the character of a Christian Church, although they may be considered as a Christian sect, like the various sects of philosophers of old. And not being a Christian Church, they are no part of the *body* of Christ, which is *knit together by joints and bands* of Christ's appointment—even by his duly authorised ministers and divine sacraments.

It being then as clear as the lucid rainbow in the heavens, that the Christian Church is a divine institution—a sacred society of Christ's own formation, it necessarily follows, that the ministry which he gave it, must be continued for ever, unless it can be proved, that he has given power to any set of men to alter it. Hence it follows also, that the people can no more make a Christian Church than they can make a world. And the inevitable consequence from this is, that the independent or congregational system, which makes the ministry result from the people, destroys the Church as a *society*, and leaves it no character but that of a *sect*.

The inquiry is now brought to this simple question—Was the Church left under the Episcopal or the Presbyterian form? And as this is a matter of fact, to be determined like all other matters of fact, by historical evidence, all I shall say upon this

point is this—the Apostles were ordained by Christ the first governors of his Church; and with them and their successors, he has promised to be to the end of the world. The Apostles did ordain Bishops (according to the whole current of antiquity) as governors in the Churches which they planted; and those Bishops were esteemed the successors of the Apostles, each in his own Church, from the beginning to this day. This was the language of the purest ages. *Omnes Apostolorum successores sunt*, says Jerome. And St. Ignatius, who was constituted by the Apostle's Bishop of Antioch, salutes the Church of the Trallians, *in the plenitude of the Apostolic character*. Thus it continued till the *reformation*; in all which time there is not sufficient ground to believe that there was one Church in the whole world that was not Episcopal. And as the conferring of orders was attached to the Episcopal office, those churches which abandoned Episcopacy, lost their character as Churches, and retained nothing but that of a Christian sect. This is an unpleasant consequence; but if Bishops be of divine institution, and the power of ordaining be attached to their order, the consequence is inevitable.

I shall now close this long letter with a few observations respecting the preaching, the conduct, and deportment of the ministers of religion.

As to preaching, the subjects on which you will address your hearers, are the most important that can ever occupy the attention of man. Life or death, happiness or misery, you are to hold up to them as the end of their earthly career. It therefore becomes you to use every effort to awaken them to a sense of their danger, and every proper mode of address to excite in them a solicitude about their salvation. “Never,” says the eloquent *Saurin*, “had orators a finer opportunity of being heard with attention. Never were subjects more susceptible of a grave, majestic, and pathetic eloquence, than those themes which we treat of. We have the most powerful motives to work with, and the most powerful passions to work upon. We have an eternity of glory to promise, and an eternity of misery to threaten. We are sent by a Master, in whose presence all the kings in the universe are but as the small drop in the bucket, or the dust in the balance.” Is it then possible to conceive a situation in which an orator can be placed to more advantage?

The pleader at the bar, the speaker in a deliberative assembly, has not such themes of grandeur and interest, as the Christian orator. The motives which the former have to propose are temporal ; those of the latter, are eternal—the motives of the one, regard only the life of the body ; the motives of the other the life of the soul. Should you not then be deeply interested ? and with such a feeling, should not your concern animate every tone of your voice, and every feature of your countenance ? Is it not disgusting to see a preacher of the gospel, who is expatiating on subjects that would increase a seraph's fire, talking with as much indifference, as if he were telling the most trifling and uninteresting story. Cold, marble hearts have no business in the pulpit ; let them stand behind a counter. They will serve God and their neighbour much better in that situation, than in the consecrated temple. Their coldness will better answer the purpose of accurate calculation, than the dignified position of a preacher of righteousness.

You will not, I trust, misconceive me on this point. You will not suppose that I am recommending a canting, theatrical, vehement, vociferating mode of delivery. No. Such a manner always disgusts me, lacerates my feelings, and excites in me the utmost detestation. I mean a warmth which proceeds from strong feeling, and a deep concern for the salvation of others ; and which is perfectly consistent with the chastest delivery, and with the rule of never overleaping the boundaries of nature.

But, my friend, however excellent your sermons may be, and however animated and natural your manner of delivery, yet if your life be not that of a Christian, depend upon it, you will be a very useless minister of religion. No man indeed who possesses a spark of reason will expect you to be free from failings ; they are the unavoidable lot of humanity. But every human being, the very infidel and profligate, will expect you to be free from every species of vice. Nay, even this will be considered by the serious and religious as worthy of no great degree of praise. They will expect you to possess positive virtue and genuine piety. They will expect you to be *a man of God*, not only from holiness of office, but from holiness of life. To this standard you must rise, or you will never do any good in the ministry.

To suppose that preaching well, without living well, will pro-

note the salvation of men, is too gross to be admitted. The minister of religion may depend upon it, that he is more eloquent by his life than by his preaching. In the one way, he addresses his audience but once in a week ; in the other, he preaches every day.

“ The voice
Is but an instrument, on which the priest
May play what tune he pleases. In the deed,
The unequivocal, authentic deed,
We found sound argument ; we read the heart.”

Cowper.

Of such importance to the success of the ministry is the holy life of its priests, that the emperor *Julian* supposed that he could make heathenism prevail over Christianity, if he could but bring the priests of idolatry to live as virtuously as those of Christ. This was a noble testimony to the purifying nature of Christian principles ; and shows that *Julian's* acute mind considered a good life so nearly allied to the power of persuasion, that without it all the eloquence in the world would never promote piety and virtue. This indeed is the *star*, which, like that of *Bethlehem*, leads men to Jesus, and induces them, like the Eastern *Magi*, to offer him gifts—the gifts of praise, of adoration, and of a holy life.

You must then, if you mean to be a successful minister, be both virtuous and pious. You must show yourself *the servant of the Lord* in all things. You “ must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.” You “ must cease from anger,” and “ forsake wrath.” You “ must overcome evil with good,” and leave malice and revenge to the children of this world. Under the trials of life, and the difficulties that will be thrown in your way by unreasonable men, like *Aaron* you must hold your peace ; like *Eli* you must bow your head ; and like the *Shunamite* you must say, *It is well.**

To these virtues, let me add another—a sincere and ardent love for your people. This will support you under the labour

* These beautiful expressions are somewhere in Smith's Lectures.

and trials of the clerical life ; will enable you to bear with the froward, patiently to instruct the ignorant, to visit, reprove and exhort *in season and out of season, and from house to house.* And this affectionate disposition of mind will not only have a happy influence on yourself, but it will cause all you say to be well received by your people. "Love your people (said the pious Augustin) and you may say what you please." There is a good deal of truth in this observation. When a people are satisfied of the affection of their pastor, there is hardly any thing amiss in him. All he says and does is right. His reproofs may cut to the quick ; yet they do not offend. His sermons, though plain and indifferent in their texture, will be affectionately received, because affectionately delivered. His visits will be grateful, because of the motive from which they flow. Loving his people, he will be sweet in his temper, affable in his deportment, and condescending to the very lowest. In short, he will be influential and successful, because amiable and affectionate.

I hope this long letter will not trespass on your patience. It has not, I can assure you, on mine. On such subjects I could write many sheets with pleasure. If what I have said should prove beneficial to you in any degree, I shall be much gratified. I conclude with the Apostle's request,—"*If there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.*"

With the best wishes for your usefulness in this world, and your happiness in the next, I am your friend and humble servant,

A. F.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[From a wish to conclude in the present volume the letters of the Rev. Dr. Kemp to Dr. Miller, we are induced to extend this number beyond the usual quantity of pages, in order to insert the following letter, which is the last of the series.]

(Continued from p. 393, and concluded.)

LETTER IX.

Comparisons of the piety of different denominations improper. Truth independent of the conduct of men. Good principles to be maintained for their practical influence, but no judgment to be formed of the principles of a community from appearance. False principles apt to mingle with true. Less hypocrisy, &c. in the Church than in any other communion. The causes of the depression of the Church in America. Succession. Recapitulation. Reason for the present undertaking. Conclusion.

REV. SIR,

I Enter upon the examination of your last letter, with some reluctance. I could have wished, that the controversy had been confined to a mere discussion of principles and doctrines. Comparisons of the piety or religion of different denominations of Christians, are, in my judgment, neither very wise, nor productive of any good effects.

The members of the Church will never find in me an apologist for their lukewarmness or their impiety. Nor would I wish, in any degree, to create or encourage a spirit that would incite them to believe that they were righteous, so as to despise others. While I support and defend the Church as truly apostolic, I would tell the members, that they are as a city set upon a hill—that they are the salt of the earth—and I would warn them against the sore condemnation of those, who, while light has come into the world, have loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.

Truth cannot be essentially affected by the conduct of men.

Jesus Christ was no less the Messiah, the Saviour of the world, when he was deserted by his followers, nay, when even the Apostles themselves were upon the point of leaving him, than when he was followed by wondering and astonished crowds. The Church of Christ has in reality continued to be the same, although sometimes labouring in adversity, sometimes exalted by prosperity—though sometimes obscured and defaced by error, and again regenerated by the friendly hand of prudent and intelligent piety.

Not but that we defend and maintain correct principles for their beneficial effects—not but that we adhere to and support the true Church of Christ, as well for the blessings and advantages to be enjoyed in that Church as to avoid the sin of schism. Still we do aver, that it is a false and fallacious position that the soundness of the principles of any community, or the purity and integrity of a Church, in point of principles and doctrine, are to be ascertained even by the general conduct of its members. Suppose, Sir, for the sake of argument, a person unacquainted with Christianity was to be ushered into the United States, and told that the only safe way to decide the important question to what religious society he *should* attach himself, was to join that in which there was the appearance of *the largest portion of fervent piety and strict morality*. This would be acting upon your principle. Admit then, that he joined the Quakers. Upon examining their tenets, and comparing them with the Bible, he finds them to be erroneous in many respects. Would he not then discard your rule of judgment; nay, would he not even be ready to upbraid you, for leading him into error, in so important an affair? Would he not say—I ought to have resorted to the Bible, and not to have judged from the variable and uncertain appearance of the conduct of man?

The fallacy of your principle consists in the appeal to a human tribunal to judge of the state and principles of the heart. Man can only judge from appearance. It is God that judgeth righteous judgment. We may see many favourable symptoms. We may see an exact and uniform attention to the public ordinances of religion—we may hear of much private devotion, and we may perceive a general sanctity of life. But were we to conclude from all this, that there was much genuine holiness, we might be wrong. Besides, there are in religion, many counter-

feits, and many false principles, that are apt to associate with the true, and to produce effects violent and imposing. Indeed false principles in religion act with the violence and impetuosity of human passions, while true principles are calm and moderate in their effects. Superstition is more violent than true faith—fanaticism, than the genuine influence of the holy spirit—blind and bigotted zeal, than a rational attachment to the true Church. Divine means are in their operation calm and reasonable, whereas human devices are ardent and furious. Seldom have Christians witnessed any thing equal to the effects of camp meetings, at their first institution. The annals of enfuried fanaticism can hardly produce any thing similar to the *exercises*, as described in a pamphlet called "*Glad Tidings*."

As the ground that you have assumed then, is entirely fallacious, so the manner in which you have treated Episcopalians, I must say, is unfair. In as much as they cannot admit your Church to be constituted upon the apostolic model, you charge them with exclusive pretensions to being in covenant with God, or entitled to his promises. Do they deny you, Sir, the benefits arising from a divine revelation? Do they deny you the advantages of faith in a Redeemer? Or do they pretend to call in question the sincerity of your belief, that your Church is a true Church? Even, if they did with regard to those, who possess the means of better information, they could not with regard to numbers that have never enjoyed these advantages. You have stated the case, as it stands not between any two denominations of professing Christians, but as it stands between Christians and heathens, who "*are aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise;*" whereas, the only difference is, that we ascribe your form of Church government to the mistakes of Calvin, and you ours, to the ambition of ecclesiastics. Were we to admit then, that you are more correct than we are, we should have a right to demand of you a degree of purity pre-eminent in proportion as divine institution is superior to human ambition. And our case, I imagine, would be at least as good as yours, were we to say, in your words, "*is this in fact the case?*"

Your remarks upon the efficacy of Episcopal government are of a complexion, not much calculated to injure our cause, or to advance yours. I really think Episcopacy will not shrink from

a comparison with Presbyterianism, in its nature, tendency, or effects. "I am willing," with you, "to refer the decision of this question to any man who is acquainted with ecclesiastical history." If Presbyterianism be of divine origin, it would seem strange, that it should have existed so short a time! that it should have preserved the Church only forty, a hundred or two hundred years! That in so short a time, schisms and divisions should so defeat the energy and influence of a divine system, as to need the interference of human aid, as you think St. Jerome intimates, would appear truly wonderful!

From the primitive Church, if we descend to the Reformation, we shall find, that in those Churches which were reformed upon Presbyterian principles, there was as much strife and bitterness, as much extravagance and outrage, as in any on earth. And if we come down still farther, and view England, when the Church was suppressed and Presbyterianism prevailed, we shall behold a dreadful mixture of fanaticism, superstition, bigotry, and ferocious intolerance. *Mr. Wilberforce*, who will not be charged with any undue bias against Dissenters, says, "During the period of the civil wars, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity were grievously abused by many of the sectaries, who were foremost in the commotions of those unhappy times; who, while they talked copiously of the free grace of Christ, and the operations of the Holy Spirit, were by their lives an open scandal to the name of Christian." *Wilberforce's View*, page 228.

Before you had so severely animadverted upon the "*lawless ambition and indecent strife of diocesan Bishops*," I think it would have been well for you to have viewed the matter more closely, and examined whether the same reflections might not be retorted upon those who have sustained the title of Presbyters. It is not for you and me to decide upon the piety of others. But I think I hazard nothing in saying, that confining myself to Protestant Bishops, there has been more piety, more learning, and more exalted virtue among them than among any other description of persons of the same number. And to what Episcopal Churches you allude, when you say that "all varieties of theological creeds are received by them," I am unable to tell. Thus much is true as to the Protestant Episcopal Church, that she has never altered one single article of her doctrines since the reformation. Nor do I know of a single schism that

has taken place since that period, but that of the Methodists. Whereas, among those who embrace the doctrine of parity, there are Presbyterians—Independents—Seceders—Socinians, with many others of less note, who, all constitute distinct communions, “Is this then the unity of the spirit?”

While I disclaim the right of judging in what communion there is most genuine holiness, I would ask, if there is not in the Church less *hypocrisy*—less *superstition*—less *bigotry*—less *artifice*? I would ask whether there is not more reliance upon divine means, and less dependence upon human devices? I would ask, whether any other Church can be produced that has given to the world so many excellent works of science—so many books in illustration of the scriptures—so many learned and pious sermons? I would ask any man of information, whether the Church has not been considered as the grand luminary of the reformation, and the bulwark of the Protestant Religion? And her *Wilsons*, her *Taylors*, her *Beveridges*, her *Seckers*, her *Hornes*, her *Porteus*, I am willing to compare with any other ministers that ever lived. Besides, it will not be denied that a character formed upon the principles of the Church must be an excellent character. This then is enough for me.

The Church in America is just now beginning to feel the influence of a regular Episcopacy. Through the opposition of the Presbyterians and the mistaken policy of the British government, no Episcopate was permitted in America before the revolution; and, of course, the Church was in a state of languor and privation. To this succeeded a frantic and desolating fanaticism, which will pass away like a blast. And it is already evident in many places, that nothing has been gained in the Southern States by the destruction of the Church. The people possess a new religion with less virtue.

All new sects value themselves upon the piety of their members, and the appearance of this they preserve for a time, through the influence of peculiar tenets and a strict discipline to which they submit, from a variety of considerations. The Methodists in England, and the Seceders in Scotland, valued themselves upon a degree of piety, which, they said, those from whom they separated did not possess. Yet men of discernment could not avoid seeing the influence of spiritual pride, opposition, and bigotry, all combined, in producing this appearance. It is pleasing to

find, in the general opinion, little of all this in the Church. Churchmen who are really religious, are noble characters, disfigured by no unseemly peculiarities—distorted by no wayward biases. And in the various relations of life I believe they are not inferior. They appear to be as good members of society, as affectionate husbands, and as kind parents as any others. And if I am not mistaken, they are less attached to the world than many others. All this, perhaps, you will say is not religion; but, I must contend, that these are features of the character of our blessed Lord, and they are things, in their own nature, more open to our judgment, than such as are relied upon by those who boast of their piety.

Succession in the Ministry.

I am glad to find that your writers begin to yield up their opposition to the doctrine of succession in the ministry; a doctrine against which there could be no reasoning, but there was much satire and ridicule, ill pointed and injudiciously applied. When our blessed Lord formed a spiritual community, and regularly commissioned its officers—when his inspired apostles pursued the same plan, nothing could justify a deviation from this plan, but permission from heaven. I have no hesitation in saying, that, in my judgment, an interruption in the succession destroys the nature of a spiritual community, and gives it every character of a temporal association. Temporal associations are formed to answer certain purposes, as far as human discernment can calculate. Succession in their offices is preserved, until it be found that they require to be amended or abolished. Nothing of this kind can happen to a divine plan. This reasoning, in my view, is entirely conclusive.

But we have been asked for the records of our Church, that contain the line of bishops. Suppose those records to have been lost; this will never alter the case, unless it can be proved that deviations were made and allowed. But this our opponents have never been able to do. The learned Mr. William Law, in his letters to bishop Hoadley, has, in my opinion, placed this subject in a view to command the most implicit belief.—See *Scholar Armed*.

As to your succession, it has been said that neither Calvin nor Knox were ordained. And if a doubt hang upon this

point, the same must exist with regard to his followers. This however, concerns you. With us, the ordination of Calvin or of Knox is of no avail.

Recapitulation.

I have now, Sir, I think, answered all your arguments against Episcopacy. You have, in a variety of instances, mistaken the doctrines of Episcopalians, but far be it from me to charge you with voluntary misrepresentation. I too may have sometimes mistaken you. I am sure I have in no instance wilfully perverted your meaning. I flatter myself then, that Episcopacy is still safe.

In the arguments advanced in support of parity, I must confess I have found no solidity. In the application and illustration of the quotations from the Fathers, to prove its existence in the primitive Church, I have seen much error and mistake. I have not been able to perceive any connection between one Commission and one Order. I have plainly shown that although the term Bishop was sometimes applied to the order of Presbyters, yet there was an order superior to this in the Apostles; and for the continuation of this order there was provision made by the Apostles themselves. I have found no proof that the Church was organized on the model of the Synagogue, and if it had, the government of the Synagogue has been shown not to be Presbyterian.

I have proved, that there are no instances of ordination recorded in scripture, where an Apostle was not the *sole* or the *principal* ordainer; and I have also proved, that this power was explicitly conferred on Timothy and Titus, together with the right of ruling the elders.

I have proved, that there is not an early Father or an early historian, that does not speak of the ministry as Episcopal; and that nothing but an unnatural application of the terms, and an undue violation of the explanations and allusions could have countenanced the opinion that parity prevailed.

I have also proved, that the great object of the reformers was, to restore the church to a pure and simple Episcopacy, although from the darkness of the times, and the numerous impediments thrown in the way, this was only effected in some countries—that Calvin was the author of parity—and that no Church

that was not under his control admitted this doctrine—that the divines of England, although divided as to some points, excluded the doctrine of parity, and fixed their Church upon what they believed to be the divine model.

Finally, I have shown, that for so great a change in the polity of the Church to have taken place, and not a single trace of it to be found in the records of the time, is not only improbable, but even impossible; and that as to the *time* and *cause* of the introduction of Episcopacy, you differ with some of the most learned and acute of your own communion.

While I cannot perceive, therefore, that you have loosened a single pillar in the fabric of Episcopacy, I give you due credit for your laudable attempts to inspire a spirit of toleration into your brethren. But if you had not charged us, at least some of us, with “bigotry and positiveness,” your admonition might have had more effect. It is not easy to respect those who are said to be stained with faults, nor is it a very effectual way to teach others to respect persons by loading them with blame. We would wish our members to look upon your errors with a favourable eye, because we know long indulged habits of thinking not easy to be subdued, nor the prepossessions of education soon to be overcome.

I had advanced in making remarks upon your letters as far as the eighth, before I knew that any other answer was deemed necessary or intended. And when I was informed, that the Rev. Dr. Bowden was employed in that business, I immediately relinquished all thoughts of proceeding, till farther reflection and other circumstances produced the determination to offer my remarks, through the medium, and in the manner in which they now appear. I had also other reasons, at that time, for relinquishing the prosecution of my original plan. I was soon to be engaged in the management of an academy, which, added to the engagements and duties of an extensive cure, would greatly employ my time; and my remote situation excluded the possibility of being able to consult many authors. Under all these disadvantages, I only proposed to answer you from the materials afforded by yourself. I might have added many more quotations from the Fathers, in proof that Episcopacy was the primitive government of the Church; I might have added many more circumstances, and many more authorities in proof and

in illustration of the points in question, had it not been for the causes above mentioned. I have denied myself the pleasure of reading Dr. Bowden's book, determined to conduct my answer in my own way, and from my own resources.

If I have betrayed any symptoms of asperity, I hope it may be ascribed to the nature of the subject and to my manner of writing. I am sure I have felt no emotions of the kind. Those who know me, will not charge me with uncharitableness towards Presbyterians in general. Some of that denomination are my constant hearers and my particular friends, from whom I have received many acts of kindness. To vindicate and support what, upon sober and serious conviction, I myself believe to be the truth, has been my sole object. And I take my leave of you, Sir, with a fervent prayer to Almighty God, that, by his holy spirit, he would enlighten both our understandings, that we may comprehend his will, and strengthen our hearts, that we may perform it.

I am, Rev. Sir,

With due esteem,

Your most obedient humble servant,

JAMES KEMP.

Cambridge, Great Choptank parish, Maryland, Dec. 6, 1809.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

ON THE BIRTH OF A SON.

JOY to my *Isa*, great as is my joy
For this, heaven's bounteous gift, this lovely boy,
This dearest pledge of an unceasing flame,
That gives thee a mother's, me a father's name.—
Oh! may his days with health and peace be crown'd,
And every fragrant virtue bloom around!
May no rank weed this happy soil infest,
No noxious vice spring up within his breast,
His Maker's holy image to efface,
Or put once more his Saviour to disgrace!
Our's is the task to cultivate, improve
This little spot, this garden of our love;

To raise the feeble plants, which virtue shoots,
 And deeply fix their young and tender roots ;
 That when temptation's dreaded storms arise—
 When clouds of passion darken all the skies—
 When sin and vice rush on with rapid course,
 They may withstand and brave the torrent's force.
 And Oh ! what joy beyond expression great,
 Will in our fond parental bosoms beat,
 To see this trust which to our heart is given,
 Belov'd on earth, approv'd and blest by heaven !
 But if to vice and wickedness a prey,
 If all our cares and pains be thrown away,
 If Satan o'er his rebel heart should reign,
 And proffer'd grace be offer'd him in vain—
 Avert my God !—avert so dire a doom,
 And snatch him early to the peaceful tomb,
 E'er grief and anguish close his mother's eyes—
 E'er in despair his wretched father dies !

I. W.

ON CHANTS.

[*An extract from the preface to a work entitled, "The Churchman's Choral Companion to his Prayer Book ; consisting of Chants, Responses, and Anthems, with Scripture Hymns set to appropriate melodies ; composed, selected, and adapted to the usage of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in two, three, and four parts, with thorough Bass, for the Organ or Piano Forte. By the Rev. WILLIAM SMITH, D. D."*]

"SET forms of prayer and praise have ever been characteristics of the Church, and she has always manifested a predilection for those melodies which are called Chants. Admitting a more extensive theme of praise than either Anthems or Metre Psalms, Chants have, in every age of the Church, been considered as eminently subservient to spiritual edification and com-

fort. However venerable Anthems may be, and however proper to be used occasionally, one consideration militates against them, namely, that they preclude the body of the people from any share in the oblation of praise, and thereby render it the exclusive privilege of a choir ; whilst metre psalm-singing, by its fluctuating nature, and restless spirit of novelty, is an object of attention to the young, and of neglect to the aged. Even the frequent departures in the poetry, from the spirit and sublimity of the prose, are no small objections to rhythmical praise ; for, as Dr. Beattie, in his *Moral and Critical Discourses* (vol. ii. p. 410,) says, ‘ As Psalms may, in prose, as easily as in verse, be adapted to music, why should we seek to force those divine strains into the measures of Roman or modern song ? He who translated Livy into Iambics, and Virgil into monkish rhyme, did not act more absurdly. In fact, sentiments of devotion are rather depressed than elevated by the arts of the European versifier.

“ This work is designed to furnish the Protestant Episcopal Churches in the United States, with a form of services in prose, and is so adapted, as to hold a medium between the voluminous and difficult service of the Cathedral, and that which is unadorned, and merely parochial. By Cathedral Choirs, all the Responses, and the principal parts of the service, are chanted ; in the parochial manner, all the service is read, in alternate response by the Priest and people. But, as most of our Churches are unendowed, and unable to support regular choirs ; such as they may at any time have, can be no other than voluntary, and, consequently, mutable, according to the inclination and circumstances of the singers. Accommodated to the existing circumstances of our Churches at large, the following services are composed. The music is simple, easily learned, but capable of greatly enlivening the several offices of our holy religion. To its due performance, it is not necessary that the Priest should be a singer ; his immediate duty is, to give out, according to the prescribed rubric, the first versicle of the Chant or Anthem which is to be sung ; and where no rubric is prefixed, the singers are supposed to require no index to direct their choice. Single and double Chants constitute all the music of Morning and Evening Prayer, except the Doxology Anthems, and Kent’s favourite Jubilate Anthem. The Litany and Communion office

are embellished with Chants, Responses, and short Anthems, for the sake of variety. There are frequent instances likewise, in all the offices, of the same words being set to different melodies, with a view to suit different tastes."

* * * * *

"But after a faithful compliance with all the directions that can be given, and how gracefully soever the sacrifice of praise may be performed as to externals, without the accompaniment of the heart, it will be an unacceptable oblation. It is the heart that prays and praises. The melody of the voice may sound exceedingly pleasant to the ears of fellow-mortals, but the melody of the heart only renders the external chorus acceptable to him who approveth not as man approveth. It ought, therefore, to be the delight of all to whom God hath given the endowments of speech, ear, and voice, frequently to employ them in his service; but especially in his own house, on the appointed times for public worship, it is the bounden duty of every Christian, so far as he is able, to "sing Psalms unto the honour of his Redeemer's name, and to make his praise to be glorious."

"For every solemnity that occurs throughout the year, ample variety of music is here presented; but, in using this variety, even when the same melodies occur in the daily service of the Church, our organs, voices, and hearts ought to be attuned to the immediate subject of the particular Fast or Feast, which we are assembled to celebrate. And so great is the simplicity of these Chants, and so chaste and harmonious their modulation, that they will imperceptibly steal upon the ear, and with ease any congregation may, in a short time, unite in the performance of them. Indeed, Chants are the only kind of music which is calculated for general use in public worship. That this is no unfounded assertion, the consent of all Episcopal Churches in every period of time is ample proof. Into the Jewish Synagogue no other music than Chants has ever found admission. Even the followers of Mahomet observe the same rule. In every age and country where Christianity has prevailed, Chants have been its inseparable attendants. Chants may, therefore, be justly denominated the canonical music of the Church. The music to which our Lord, with his disciples, before his passion, sung the great Paschal Hymn, namely, the 113th, 114th, 115th, 116th, 117th, and 118th Psalms, was a Jewish Chant. The

prison doors opening by the concussion of a miraculous earthquake, restored the prisoners Paul and Silas to their liberty, and to the exercise of their office, whilst they were employed in chanting the praises of God their Saviour. Treating of the music of the primitive Church, Bishop Hickee quotes, from one of the ancient Fathers, these remarkable words: 'With our prayers and praises, we encompass, we besiege the throne of God, and bring such united force, as is not easily to be withstood.' Upwards of seven hundred years before the Christian æra, Isaiah described the seraphic music of heaven in such terms as indicate its similarity to that of the primitive Christians; and in the Revelation, St. John describes a choir of glorified spirits praising God in a similar strain.

"At Antioch, the followers of Jesus were first denominated Christians. From Antioch, such Chants as were transferred from the service of the Temple into that of the Church, were, by the original promulgators of Christianity, disseminated among all nations. This is a natural consequence of the first converts from Judaism retaining an attachment to their national sacred music; but in process of time, it was partially or wholly superseded by Christian melodies. Whilst the Antiochean or Jewish Chants pervaded the Eastern, the Gregorian, soon after the time of Pope Gregory, became the canonical music of all the Western Churches which paid obedience to Rome. In those not immediately connected with that See, the Antiochean Chants continued to be used, until they were exchanged for the Ambrosian. These prevailed in the British Churches, until about the year 500; and in several Churches upon the continent of Europe, until different periods; but in the French Church, to about the year 800, the æras in which those nations became spiritual subjects of the Roman Pontiff, when the Ambrosian Chants were superseded by the Gregorian, which prevailed until the reformation. During the progress of the reformation, English words were at first set to Gregorian Chants; but the Roman measures of music, not properly synchronizing with the quantity and emphasis of English Psalms, soon gave way to national compositions, which were better adapted to the vernacular language. Those Chants which are at the present time in use in the British Churches, are modern compositions, by masters of Cathedral choirs, and amateurs among the clergy."

From the Antijacobin Review and Magazine, for September, 1809.

EXTRAORDINARY INSTANCE OF EARLY GENIUS AND PIETY.

Primitiæ; or Essays and Poems, on various Subjects, religious, moral, and entertaining. By Connop Thirlwall, ELEVEN YEARS OF AGE. Second edition. Preface by his father, the Rev. T. Thirlwall, A. M. Minister of Tavistock Chapel, &c. Small 8vo. pp. 244. 6s. Tipper. 1809.

THOUGH the literary history of Europe record many instances of precocity of genius, and exhibit some specimens of extraordinary powers manifested at a very early age ; though Bononcini composed, and performed in, an opera when nine years old ; though Lope de Vega made verses at five ; Tasso at seven ; and though Pope, when a mere boy, received a shilling from Dryden for translating Ovid's *Pyramus and Thisbe* ; none of these infantine efforts are, we confidently affirm, to be compared with the "*Primitiæ*" of this extraordinary child. Young Thirlwall may, possibly, have been exceeded by some of these rare favourites of nature, in the mere powers of imagination, though we are by no means disposed to admit that such is the fact, but in every thing which may be said to constitute *mind* ; in habits of reflection ; in moral discrimination ; in sound judgment ; in disciplined feelings ; in well-regulated affections ; and, above all, in religious principles, deeply inculcated, duly appreciated, and wisely applied, he towers above competition, his superiority is manifest, striking, and decided. The imputation of these faculties to a child of eleven years, for he was no more, when he composed the last essay, in this volume, may, perhaps, be regarded with suspicion, and, possibly, attributed to partiality or prejudice. But let any one peruse the contents of the volume before us with attention, and he will, we are convinced, be little inclined to dispute the justice of the character which we have given of the mind whence they sprang.

The following is a fair specimen of these juvenile productions.

Composed on Christmas Day, 1806, when nine years old.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."—Isaiah ix. 6.

"I shall, in the following discourse, undertake to show, that Christ was the child alluded to in my text, and that these magnificent titles could not, with justice, be attributed to any one else, since he alone was worthy of them, and has fully justified the prediction of the prophet. The titles are such as could not be attributed to any mortal; and he, for whom they are intended, must be something more than man. And who could better answer these titles, than the Son of God? was not he, in every description, Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace? Yes, certainly! This Son was the same as he, who was to be brought forth of a virgin, and whose name was to be Jesus, who should save his people from their sins. But let us now consider these titles of the Redeemer.

"In the first place, he is styled Wonderful: he is wonderful for his love to mankind, which prompted him to descend from heaven, to make atonement for our sins; he is wonderful for his humility in descending from the height of glory, which he enjoyed in heaven, and in submitting himself to be made in the form of a man, and, finally, to be put to an ignominious death. Do we want knowledge? We have in him a counsellor, able to reveal every thing to us; to unfold to us every mystery; to show us every thing we desire to know, and to impart to us all knowledge; in short, a counsellor of infinite wisdom, and ready to impart that wisdom to us. He is the mighty God. In this respect he is able to destroy both body and soul in hell; he is able to reduce the sinner to the lowest brink of misery, and to elevate the true believer to the height of joy. When blasted by the stormy winds of adversity, he can assure his faithful servant of a safe arrival in his heavenly kingdom, where all his sorrows will die away, and where uninterrupted bliss reigns. He is not only the protector, but he is the chastiser of those who

rebel against his laws and government. He is the everlasting Father, or the Father of eternity. In this description he comforts under every affliction in this life, and afterwards will give them an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and which fadeth not away. He is, finally, styled the Prince of Peace. This is the most glorious of all his titles; in this character he came down from heaven to atone for the transgressions of mankind, and to reconcile man to his offended Creator, when by his insults he had justly provoked the wrath of his Maker, and was about to suffer the punishment of eternal death and torment, to which the divine justice sentenced him. The Prince of Peace descended from his throne of glory to assume the shape of a servant, and to suffer for the sins of the human race.

“To conclude. And ought not the birth of such a being to fill us with astonishment at the power, and with love at the mercy of God? Ought we not to rejoice at the birth of a Saviour, who, if we want knowledge, is able and willing to impart it to us; if protection, to relieve us in every necessity; if comfort, to comfort us under every affliction, by assurances of eternal happiness; and if reconciliation, who came down for the express purpose of making peace between God and us? Surely the birth of such a Saviour ought to be the subject of the greatest joy to us. And every time this day occurs, we ought to be the more and more fixed in a full determination to spend our lives in the glory of God, who, when we had by repeated insults provoked his displeasure, sent his only and beloved Son into the world to take our nature, and to suffer for our sins.”

But our readers will naturally expect some little account of the author. He is the son, as the title page informs us, of the Reverend Thomas Thirlwall, Chaplain to the Bishop of Down; a most respectable clergyman, who enforces the excellence of his precepts by the rectitude of his conduct. It would be a work of supererogation to expatiate on the character of a father who has brought up such a son. We have the best authority for judging of a tree by the fruit which it produces, and young Thirlwall's book is the best certificate that could be framed of the religious and moral character of his parents. With all the native powers with which a bounteous Providence has endued the youth, he never could have exhibited such proofs of mental excellence, had not his parents exerted the most anx-

ious care, and the most unremitting diligence, in inculcating sound religious principles in his infant mind.

In a short preface, written with that modesty which is the constant companion of genuine merit, Mr. Thirlwall, speaking of his son, informs us,

"That at a very *early* period he read English so well, that he was taught Latin at three years of age, and at four read Greek with an ease and fluency which astonished all who heard him. From that time he has continued to improve himself in the knowledge of the Greek, Latin, French, and English languages. His talent for composition appeared at the age of seven, from an accidental circumstance. His mother, in my absence, desired his elder brother to write his thoughts upon a subject for his improvement, when the young author took it into his head to ask her permission to take also the pen in hand. His request was complied with of course, without the most remote idea he could write an intelligible sentence, when in a short time he composed that which is first printed, '*On the Uncertainty of Life.*' From that time he was encouraged to cultivate a talent, of which he gave so flattering a promise, and generally on a Sunday chose a subject from scripture. The following Essays are selected from these lucubrations."

Mr. Thirlwall declares, "in distinct and unequivocal terms, that the following work is exclusively the production of him whose name it bears;" and then, modestly and piously adds,

"The only credit which his parents lay claim to, is their anxious solicitude to inculcate, in the minds of their children, principles of religion and virtue, and I indulge a hope that the example and instruction of a pious and virtuous mother will never be forgotten; that her anxiety to promote their temporal and eternal welfare will be abundantly rewarded, and her happiness crowned by returns of gratitude from her dutiful, affectionate, and virtuous children."

There is certainly good grounds for the indulgence of such a hope, and it is our devout wish that it may not be disappointed.

Mr. Thirlwall has anticipated an objection which might possibly be urged by some to the publication of this volume, on the ground that the praises which it might be expected to call forth would produce an injurious effect on the mind of the young

author. This objection he has, judiciously and satisfactorily, answered; expressing his conviction that such commendation will operate as a stimulus to the improvement of his talents, and the pursuit of learning: while the book, as a public record of his religious principles, will be "a swift witness against the future violation of them." If it were a mere work of imagination, a mere display of infant genius, we should have apprehensions on this head; but the reflection which it manifests, the judgment which it displays, and, above all, the principles which it contains, are to us a sufficient surety that the author will never disgrace himself, and his first productions, by suffering vanity to obscure the many excellent qualities of his mind and heart.

THE NATIVITY OF CHRIST.

[*From Bishop Hall's Contemplations, altered by Glasse.*]

NOW is the Christian Church arrayed in her festal garments—now are the high praises of God more especially in the mouths of his people. We contemplate mercies, whereby light is given to a world that sate in darkness—we record benefits, worthy of being revealed by an angel, and celebrated by the assembled choir of heaven. Cry out and shout, O city of Sion, for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee. Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder—and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.

No sooner had the messenger from heaven delivered his embassy to the mother of our Lord, than she arose in haste, and went into the hill-country of Judea. She had been told by the angel of those wonders of divine power and mercy displayed towards the happy Elizabeth; whose unexpected fruitfulness, in her old age, was a token of other and greater miracles of omnipotence. The holy virgin is anxious to visit her venerable friend—nothing shall delay that meeting, which can only be paralleled by the felicitations of glorified spirits in the kingdom of God. Elizabeth, in ecstasies of joy, proclaims her guest to be blessed among women—applauds her faith—confirms her

hope—declares herself unworthy of a privilege so distinguished, as to receive under her roof the mother of her Lord. Mary, in humble but fervent gratitude, acknowledges the bounty of heaven—her soul doth magnify the Lord; her spirit rejoiceth in God her Saviour. “Break forth into joy, sing together—for the Lord hath comforted his people; he hath redeemed Jerusalem. Let us be glad, and shout for joy—the winter is past—the storms of affliction are over and gone. Discord is vanished away, and melted into harmony. He that is mighty hath done great things, and holy is his name.”

At length an edict of Augustus summons the holy virgin to the city of David. The providence of God directs the public actions of men to the accomplishment of his sacred purpose. The charge was universal, to innumerable subjects, through all the Roman empire. By means of this taxation, Christ shall be born in Bethlehem. Cæsar had no views but for his own advantage—God meant to fulfil his prophecies; and so to fulfil them, that they who were most nearly concerned should read his will in the events themselves, not in the steps which led to them.

What a testimony is borne to the Saviour of mankind, by the government, and by the decree, of Augustus! Now the whole world was at rest. All was quiet under the sceptre, which made preparation for the Prince of Peace. But this sceptre was departed from Judah—Herod, Cyrenius, Augustus, all were aliens. It was time for Shiloh* to come. A tribute is imposed upon the people of God—the very act of bondage is the signal of approaching liberty. At the moment when Sion said, “The Lord hath forsaken me, and my God hath forgotten me,” she is blessed by the appearance of her Redeemer—when she is most oppressed by foreign sovereignty, God sends her a king of her own, before whose throne Cæsar himself shall hereafter appear, in humble subjection!

Whither must Joseph and Mary come to be taxed, but to Bethlehem? The very place proved their descent. He who should succeed David in his throne, must also succeed him in the place of his birth. So clearly was Bethlehem described by the prophets as the scene where this great event should happen,

* See Genesis xlix. 10.

that the very priests and scribes could point it out to Herod as the city wherein the King of the Jews should be born.

Hither the blessed Mary was called on by the edict of Augustus to repair, when the time of her delivery was at hand. Joseph, who had been taught by God to love and honour her, was doubtless unwilling to expose her to so manifest a hazard—but the charge was peremptory, the obedience exemplary. That God, by whom kings reign, teaches us by example, as well as precept, to pay allegiance to lawful authority.

The difficulties of the journey are surmounted—but the daughter of David finds no compassionate shelter, no kind reception, in the city of her royal ancestor. Little did the inhabitants of Bethlehem imagine what a guest they refused. How gladly would they otherwise have opened their doors to him, through whose alone merits and intercession the kingdom of Heaven will be opened to all believers? Now, in their inhospitality they have their punishment. They have lost that honour and happiness which they might have enjoyed, and which would have far exceeded all earthly glories. But why do we reproach their ignorance, and forget our own insensibility? If we suffer worldly thoughts and sensual desires to exclude Christ from our souls, how much greater is our guilt, how much deeper our ingratitude!

O God, in what language shall we express our wonder at this humility? Thou, whom the Heaven of heavens cannot contain, when thou wouldst visit this world of thine, hast not where to lay thine head. Thou, at whose disposal are the many mansions of thy Father's house, art refused admittance into the meanest cottage of Bethlehem. Thou camest to thine own, and thine own received thee not. Hadst thou assumed the form of some mighty potentate—hadst thou taken to thyself an abundant portion of those gifts which mortals hold desirable, even then thy self-abasement would have been worthy of our grateful adoration—but when thou art content to appear in the form of a servant, and when a manger is the scene of thine humble birth, how great, how unutterable is thy condescension! Didst thou not, blessed Lord, didst thou not thus debase thyself, to teach us lowliness of mind, to sanctify poverty, to quench the spirit of arrogance in our hearts, casting down imaginations

and every high thing which exalteth itself against thee, and bringing into captivity every thought to thine obedience?

The kings of the earth are at rest, and are not summoned to attend on him to whom they owe their greatness—but the Messiah is no sooner born, than the glory of the Lord shines with brightness inexpressible on a company of shepherds, keeping watch by night over their flocks near Bethlehem.

It was no new thing for manifestations from Heaven to be vouchsafed to persons employed in the pastoral life. Among those who were thus distinguished by the divine favour, we find the holy patriarch Jacob, Moses, the legislator, and David, the king of Israel. These, and many others, while attending on their flocks, had visions and revelations from the Almighty—with these he often deigned to hold converse in their solitudes. And now the welcome message of redemption is imparted by the ministration of angels to a band of shepherds, employed in their peaceful and innocent occupation. Never have we more reason to expect a blessing from above, than while we are engaged in our respective callings with cheerful diligence, relying on the good providence of God. While a sacred terror took possession of the souls of these Israelites, a multitude of the heavenly host joined in the song of rapture, and hailed the propitious arrival of the Son of God.

How doth the divine wisdom make choice of the weak, to confound the mighty! At midnight, in the fields, to obscure and lowly persons, the light of redemption is made manifest by the choir of Heaven. No station is so mean, as to exclude us from the divine favour—the Lord of glory is an inmate of the humble soul—he putteth down the mighty from their seat, and exalteth them of low degree.

“Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good-will towards men.” O ye blessed angels, the Church of God unites her praises with yours—a thankful world, at the feet of its Deliverer, pours forth its effusions of joy, and welcomes the hour of liberty. Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler—and now, instead of drooping and pining away in miserable bondage, it flies on the wings of rapture, and sings its song of praise at the gates of Heaven—celebrating a day yet more glorious than that whereon the morning stars first sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.

No sooner do the shepherds hear tidings of a Saviour, than they repair with haste to Bethlehem—regardless of their flocks, they esteem all things as of no value, which can detain them from that blissful sight. It is not possible, that a faithful heart should hear of Christ, and not desire earnestly to approach and to enjoy him. Where art thou to be found, O Lord, but in thine house, thy word, thy sacraments? There thou seekest for us, there thou callest us to thyself. O let us make speed to find thee, and let us by faith behold the glory that is revealed. In thy light shall we see light—cast us not away from thy presence—take not thine Holy Spirit from us.

“This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, *that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.*”

ECCLESIASTICAL NEWS.

THE Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New-York, met in the city of New-York on the first Tuesday in October last. The Convention was opened as usual with divine service; a sermon was preached by the Right Rev. Bishop Moore. The following statement of the affairs of the Diocese for the past year was given by him in an address which he delivered agreeably to a Canon of the General Convention.

“BRETHREN,

“In compliance with the requisitions of the 45th Canon I make the following statement of the affairs of this Diocese since the last meeting of the Convention.

“During the last year I have administered the holy rite of Confirmation in the following Churches:

“Grace Church, Jamaica.

“St. James’s, Newtown.

“St. George’s, Flushing.

“St. Michael’s, Bloomingdale.

“Trinity Church, New-York.

“Christ Church, Hudson.

“St. Peter’s, Albany.

“St. Paul’s, Troy.

“Trinity Church, Lansingburgh.

"St. George's, Schenectady.

"At the Lutheran Church in Athens, where an Episcopal congregation assembles for public worship; and at St. Luke's, Catskill. In the course of these visitations, I have confirmed 304 persons.

"The following persons have been admitted to holy orders:

"Parker Adams, Timothy Clowes, John Croes, jun. of New-Jersey, and Adam Empie, Deacons. Joseph Perry, James D. Simmons, of South-Carolina, and Paul Trapier Gervais, from the same state, Priests.

"John Ireland, formerly rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, has been degraded from the Ministry.

"Grace Church, in New-York, has been incorporated, and the Rev. Nathanael Bowen regularly appointed the Rector thereof.

"The Rev. George Strebeck has resigned the Rectorship of St. Stephen's Church, and is succeeded by the Rev. Dr. Richard Moore; and the Church on Staten-Island is now supplied by his son, David Moore, Deacon.

"The Rev. Abraham Clarke, formerly Rector of St. James's Church, Newtown, and St. George's Church, Flushing, is now confined to the Church at Newtown; and St. George's, Flushing, has, of course, become vacant.


"Timothy Clowes, Deacon, officiates at Grace Church, Jamaica; and Adam Empie is employed as an Assistant to the Rev. Seth Hart in the Churches at South and North-Hempstead.

"The Rev. Samuel Haskill has been duly instituted Rector of Grace Church, Rye and White-Plains, which had become vacant in consequence of the much lamented death of the late Rector, Evan Rogers.

"The Rev. Barzillai Bulkley, and the Rev. Frederick Beasley, have relinquished the Rectorship of Christ Church, Poughkeepsie, and St. Peter's, Albany; which Churches are not yet supplied with Clergymen."

MARRIED,

At Newark, by the Rev. Mr. Willard, Theodore Frelinghuysen, Esq. to Miss Charlotte Mercer, youngest daughter of Archibald Mercer, Esq.

 WE embrace the opportunity, which the conclusion of another volume presents, to return our thanks to the patrons of the Magazine, and particularly to many of the Clergy who have successfully interested themselves in obtaining subscribers, and in collecting and punctually remitting the subscriptions for the work. Though we have found, by experience, that numerous difficulties and discouragements must be encountered by us in the prosecution of this publication, we are yet disposed to enter on the labours of another year with renewed vigour ; and by the introduction of as great a *variety* of topics as our limited pages will admit, to aim at rendering the work in some degree interesting to all classes of our readers. We can indeed never relinquish the defence of the principles of our Church ; nor cease to guard its members against the "heresy and schism," for deliverance from which the *Litany* teaches them fervently to pray. We shall endeavour, however, to prevent these topics from engrossing more than a due share of our pages.

The present number, our readers will perceive, is considerably enlarged, with a view to give place to the concluding letter of Dr. Kemp to Dr. Miller, which we did not deem it expedient to carry into another volume ; and, from the same circumstance, we have been prevented from inserting, as was our intention, some articles in the department of the Review.

ERRATA.

- Page 275, line 18 from the bottom, for 'sketch,' read stretch.
 279, line 14 from the bottom, for 'evidence,' read credence.
 line 10 from the bottom, instead of 'miracles then,'
 read miracles, omitting 'then.'
 317, line 5 from the bottom, for 'in,' read is.
 318, line 8, for 'whosoever,' read whatsoever.
 320, line 7 from the bottom, for 'prophets,' read prophecy.
 322, line 7 from the bottom, for 'spreads,' read spread.
 line 2 from the bottom, for 'rending,' read sending.
 323, line 2, for 'insidious,' read conscious.
 324, line 31, for 'decryed,' read denied.
 327, line 23, for 'her,' read his.
 328, line 13, for 'advancing,' read adorning.

INDEX

TO

VOL. VI

	Page.		Page.
A NDREWS, Bishop, Life of	1	Easter, Prayer suited to	113
Ashford, Isaac	36	Ecclesiastical News	51, 154, 233, 234, 464
Allen, Wm. character of	84	Eloquence, Pulpit	217
Bible and Common Prayer Book Society	154	Episcopal Church	233
Candidate for orders, letter to	425	Episcopal Syrian Church in India	283
Comparison of Calvinistic and Arminian controversy with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans	53, 115, 203, 266, 315, 410	Extract from a sermon preached in Maryland	360
Confession of Sin	70	Epitaph on an old Negro slave	370
Calvinistic points, Knox's letter on the	96, 92, 256, 330	Early genius and piety, extraordinary instance of	456
Communion, Holy, guilt, &c. of neglecting	253	Fearful man	200
Colden's observations on Whitfield's answer to the Bishop of London	349	Grace Church, N. Y. account of	79
Church Music, observations on	356	Genius and piety, early, extraordinary instance of	456
Church, improprieties of behaviour in, censured	420	Horne's, Bishop, Thoughts on various subjects	44
Christian Doctrine, &c. brief remarks on	425	Hopton, Susannah, memoirs of	237
Chants	452	Herbert, George, Rev. biographical sketch of	30, 373
Deaths	80, 234, 370	Heathen, case of according to the scriptures	410
Divinity of Christ, evidences of	274, 339	Institution	299
Episcopacy vindicated	23, 124, 184, 285, 363, 384, 443	Kemp's letters to Dr. Miller in vindication of Episcopacy	23, 124, 184, 285, 363, 384, 443
Evangelical preaching	78	Knox's letter to Green	96, 192, 256, 330

INDEX.

	Page.		Page.
Life of Bishop Andrews	1	Resurrection of Christ, evi-	
Life of Rev. Dr. Lowth	81	dences of	108
Meditations, Religious	38, 89,	Resurrection	114
	173, 249	Review of Bishop White's	
Midnight, Thoughts on	159	charge	136
Morality, Christian, superior		Review of Dr. Rodgers's	
excellence of	263	Presence of Christ, &c.	146
Music, Church, observations		Review of Cœlebs in search	
on	356	of a wife	218, 292
Marriage	465	St. John's Church, Elizabeth	
New Year, Reflections on	73	Town, account of	151
Nativity of Christ	460	St. John's Church, N. York,	
Pulpit eloquence	217	sermon at the consecra-	
Puritans, intrigues and prac-		tion of	243, 322
tices of, against the Church		Sabbath	369
of England	11	Son, on the birth of	451
Prayer for reformation of		Waterland, Daniel, D. D.	
life	71	memoirs of	161
Prayer suited to Easter	113	Widow's son raised to life	216
Prayer Book, Common, so-		Wilkins's sermon at the con-	
ciety	154	secration of St. John's	
Religious Meditations	38, 89,	Church	243, 322
	173, 249	Whitfield's answer to the	
Repentance	61	Bishop of London, obser-	
Reformation of life, prayer		vations on, by Governor	
for	71	Colden	349
Reflection during a sleep-			
less night,	76		

ge.

08

14

136

146

292

n

151

,

322

369

451

161

216

322

349

Cal

la

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl

Cl